DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 990 48 FL 001 495

By-Nostrand, Howard Lee; And Others

Background Data for the Teaching of French. Final Report. Part C, Contemporary Culture and Society of the United States.

Washington Univ., Seattle.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

Bureau No-BR-5-0934

Pub Date 67

Contract-OEC-6-14-005

Note-133p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$6.75

Descriptors-*American Culture, Bibliographies, Cross Cultural Studies, Cross Cultural Training, Cultural Background, Cultural Context, Cultural Education, Cultural Factors, Cultural Interrelationships, Cultural Traits, Ecological Factors, Literature Reviews, *Research Projects, Social Background, *Social Characteristics, *Sociocultural Patterns, *Teaching Guides, Values, Western Civilization

Identifiers-United States of America

Cross-cultural understanding and successful communication are the objectives of this study, whose approach focuses upon descriptive knowledge of the foreign culture and society. In this part (written in English), the report focuses on some main culture patterns and social institutions of the United States, under the headings of (1) value system, (2) assumptions in American culture, (3) family, (4) religious institutions, (5) economic institutions, (6) political system, (7) education, (8) intellectual-esthetic institutions, (9) recreational institutions, (10) media system, and (11) social stratification. Thus, the person with knowledge of American life can visualize his counterparts in another sociocultural system (that of France and the French-speaking world). Topical and general bibliographies are included. For a related part of this report see FL 001 494. (WB)

ED031990

4 of 4

BACKGROUND DATA FOR THE TEACHING OF FRENCH:

Final Report of Project OE-6-14-005

PART C: CONTEMPORARY CULTURE AND SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES

[Published separately are PART A: LA CULTURE ET LA SOCIETE FRANÇAISES AU XXe SIECLE, and PART B: EXEMPLES LITTERAIRES.]

The research reported herein was performed persuant to a contract with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy. This report may be quoted without permission, provided the source is duly credited; except that no material quoted herein may be requoted without the permission of its copyright holder.

Howard Lee Nostrand, Project Director

Department of Romance Languages and Literature
University of Washington

Seattle, Washington 98105

1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FL 001 495

Table of Contents for PART C

- O.[1] PROLEGOMENA 1
- O.A Rationale 1
- O.B Critique 2
- O.C Recommendations 3
- O.D Acknowledgments 5
- O.E Introduction 6
- I.A[1] THE VALUE SYSTEM 10
  - I.A.0 Introduction to the essay on the value system 11
  - I.A.1 Achievement-success; competition 12
  - I.A.2 Materialism 15
  - I.A.3 Practicality-efficiency 15
    Rationality
  - I.A.4 Future orientation 16
    - a. Progress
    - b. Change (assumption or value)
  - I.A.5 A delimited equalitarianism 17
    - a. Equal opportunity
    - b. A Humanitarian spirit (Golden Rule)
  - I.A.6 Conformism 19
    - a. Compliance
    - b. Shared Values
  - I.A.7 Self-reliance 19
    - a. Individualism
    - b. Creativity
  - I.A.8. Speculative comments 21
- I.C[1] ASSUMPTIONS IN AMERICAN CULTURE 23
  - Introduction 23
  - I.C.1 The universe is mechanistic 25
  - I.C.2 Man can become the master of the universe 25
  - I.C.3 Man is basically rational and reasoning 28
  - I.C.4 All men have inherent worth 29
  - I.C.5 Men are improvable 30
  - I.C.6 The American System is the best yet developed 40
  - Speculative comments: an assumption concerning the future of man 41

---

[1] The numbers and letters preceding the topics are derived from the "Emergent Model" presented in the report on PART A of the project: see PART A, pages 30-37.

- II.A THE FAMILY.......................................43
- II.B THE RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS.......................50
- II.C THE ECONOMIC INSTITUTIONS........................54
  - II.C.1 Structure.....................................55
  - II.C.2 The Competitive market ideal..................57
  - II.C.3 The Role of government........................58
  - II.C.4 Income distribution...........................59
  - II.C.5 Trade union and industrial relations..........60
- II.D THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SYSTEM.....................63
  - II.D.1 General.......................................65
  - II.D.2 Democracy.....................................66
  - II.D.3 The Constitution..............................67
  - II.D.4 Politics, parties, interest groups, public opinion.....68
  - II.D.5 Congress......................................70
  - II.D.6 The Presidency and the executive..............70
  - II.D.7 The Judiciary.................................71
  - II.D.8 Civil liberties...............................71
  - II.D.9 Selected content issues.......................73
- II.E AMERICAN EDUCATION................................75
- II.F THE INTELLECTUAL-ESTHETIC INSTITUTIONS............81
- II.G THE AMERICAN RECREATIONAL INSTITUTIONS............85
- II.H THE AMERICAN MEDIA SYSTEM.........................88
  - Bibliography..98
- II.J SOCIAL STRATIFICATION.............................99
  - Bibliography..104

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR CONTEMPORARY UNITED STATES CULTURE AND SOCIETY.....105
  - Sources referred to...................................105
  - Supplementary sources.................................109

BACKGROUND DATA FOR THE TEACHING OF FRENCH

CONTEMPORARY CULTURE AND SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES

PROLEGOMENA

by Howard L. Nostrand

A. Rationale

The educational objectives, the approach taken, and the postulates underlying both, have been stated in the prolegomena to the report on Part A of the project (section O. A.). In brief, the objectives are cross-cultural understanding and successful communication, and the approach focuses upon descriptive knowledge of the foreign culture and society.

It is argued there that we should aim at understanding a culture in its own terms before using contrastive analysis. In learning a foreign language, surely the student is better advised to develop first a separate "coordinate" system of symbols rather than to mingle two languages in a "compound" system.[1] In this way he learns to grasp the connotative as well as denotative meanings as they really are in the language. Later he can compare and contrast, adding the full advantage of this source of enlightenment, without incurring the disadvantage of mistaking the foreign medium for a mirror of what he already knows. So in penetrating into how "life" feels and "reality" looks to bearers of the other culture, one is better advised to try to strive for empathy before contrast.

---

[1] These concepts are defined by Nelson Brooks, Language and Language Learning. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World. 2nd ed., 1964. pp. 48 and 267.

But it is recognized, at the same time, that contrast is inevitable from the first contact with a foreign way of life, and as a result, the learner's view of his own culture and social structure plays a part from the beginning of language study. If he sees his home country only from one social class, church, region, and age group, he is bound to take a warped view of a foreign people, finding their ways more alien than they really are, even if these are presented to him in the most careful balance.

In the present project was included, therefore, the present rudimentary account of some main culture patterns and social institutions of the United States, under the same headings as are used for France in Part A and for the French-speaking world in Part B.

B. Critique

The original intention was to compile under each topic just the conclusions reached by "hard research" and it was believed that a graduate student could do this during a year, submitting brief chapters to project advisers and then to an interdisciplinary group of a university faculty before making a final revision of the chapters.

Mr. Thomas L. Van Valey, a graduate student of sociology, undertook the assignment. The interdisciplinary discussions of his draft chapters were held in the form of weekly meetings throughout the autumn quarter of 1965, and Mr. Van Valey revised the original drafts while continuing his graduate study at the University of North Carolina.

The hard-research findings proved to furnish only a spotty coverage of the topics, and disparities of underlying premises made them so difficult to piece together that our original plan must be judged unrealistic. Critics have emended the essays, so that the responsibility for their contentions does not fall wholly on Mr. Van Valey. Three of the original essays have been replaced by professors in the respective fields--namely, the economic, political, and communications institutions. In these particularly, it was not practicable to carry out the intent that each essay should follow the same plan: actual behavior, its current evolution, professed ideal, its trends, and a comparison of the two lines of development.

The problem of briefing the foreign-language teacher concerning American culture patterns and social structure has not been solved, and may never be solved within the limits of the non-specialist's time and energy. Nevertheless, the little essays presented here do help a person who has "experience of" American life, to conceptualize values, underlying assumptions, and social institutions in the same objective way in which he tries to see their counterparts in another sociocultural system.

It is certainly in order to compare these bite-size sketches with the understanding that is known to be attainable by a specialist in each aspect of this vast subject. But at the same time, one should not lose sight of the comparison between this rudimentary conceptualization and the unorganized, unexamined, unavailable experience that characterizes most teachers of other subjects.

C. Recommendations

To supersede this experimental beginning, it seems sensible to recommend the same devices as for France: automated data processing of bibliographic items and quoted passages, combined with a summary volume created and periodically revised by a multicultural team. (See the prolegomena of Part A, section O. C. 1.) American studies, already cultivated by a wide, international range of scholars,[2] could in fact deal more comprehensively with current American life, to the benefit of education both at home and abroad, if such a handbook were being constantly reworked and up-dated, and particularly if it were flanked by parallel accounts of other countries.[3]

Once it is determined what can most truthfully be said about the American sociocultural system, literary illustrations should be compiled under the appropriate headings, which it is recommended should be the same as those used for France, changing the substantive subheadings required for the specific values, assumptions, social classes, and so on. A few anthologies of American literature that approach the needed classification are mentioned in the prolegomena to Part B.

---

[2] See for example the ACLS Newsletter (American Council of Learned Societies), 1949-; and American Studies News: An International Newsletter, 1961- (Committee on American Studies, of the Committee on International Exchange of Persons, Conference Board of Associated Research Councils).

[3] Some studies have been published which come close to serving this purpose, notably the volumes on Russia, Cuba, and other countries particularly of the Communist group, prepared for the American University Foreign Area Studies Division, under the guidance of Professor Herbert H. Vreel and his associates.

D. Acknowledgments

The degree of success that has been reached in this difficult yet inescapable task is due not only to the authors of the essays and of the sources studied, but to a number of others who are not named in the report. Professor Robert Leik, the project's adviser representing sociology, assisted both in shaping the plan of operation and in revising successive drafts. Other members of the University of Washington faculty who made valuable contributions during the series of interdepartmental discussions are: Assistant Dean Norman J. Johnston of the College of Architecture and Urban Planning, Professor Roy Prosterman of the Law School, Professors Stuart C. Dodd and Herbert Costner of the Department of Sociology, Professor Benjamin Gillingham of the Department of Economics, Professor Alex Edelstein of the School of Communications, Professor John Crow of the Department of Political Science, Mr. Hollis Mentzer of the Department of Anthropology, Professor Roger Stein of the Department of English, Professor Glen Lutey of the Division of General Studies, and Professor Melville Hatch of the Department of Zoology, chairman of the interdisciplinary course, "Critical Problems of Our Culture." We are indebted to all of these, and to Miss Claudia Fisher who helped to edit the present essays and the two bibliographies that conclude this report on Part C of the project.

CONTEMPORARY CULTURE AND SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES

O.E INTRODUCTION

by Thomas L. Van Valey

Contemporary American culture is highly complex. It derives from a number of historically and geographically separate origins and varies widely in its local forms, yet the demarcations among its components are subtle and often indistinct. This work is a beginning--an attempt to integrate material available from many sources into a coherent whole which, hopefully, will produce a better understanding of "American" culture and society.

For this purpose, we are dividing the culture into the following areas: the value system, the "ground-of-meaning" assumptions, and the major social institutions (namely, familial, religious, economic, recreational, educational, intellectual-esthetic, political, and mass-communications).

Those topics will be discussed here in separate essays, all organized along similar lines. First, the area of behavior is to be described as it actually occurs. Following this, we try to indicate the professed form of the same topic: the cultural characteristic as it is supposed to occur rather than as it actually does occur. This provides us with some information as to the degree of either overt or covert conflict within the cultural milieu. At the end of each essay, some thoughts will be presented regarding forces producing change. This aspect of each topic serves as a reminder not to view culture as a static phenomenon, but as one which continually adjusts to the innovations introduced by men.

This general structure, we believe, is an appropriate one for integrating data from many sources into a concise statement of the existing cultural base. The resulting cultural summary can be useful as the base-line for comparison with other cultures.

This is not a single-purpose analysis nor a general cultural outline. It is designed to be utilized (1) as an outline of salient features of contemporary American culture for the purpose of informing "extra-culturals;" (2) as a base-line for comparison with other cultures; (3) and as a means of locating some areas of conflict in a sociocultural context.

The research prodeedure was simple. First, possible sources were screened according to one basic criterion--do they apply to American culture? If a source contained either theoretical or factual materials on any facet of American society, it was included in the master bibliography. This bibliography was then divided into two sections: general reference works which contain materials on numerous substative areas; and other sources which apply only to specific areas of concern.

Each source was then further considered in the light of various qualifications. These include the amount of expertise generally accorded its author or authors; the type of treatment given to the subject; and whether it was based on empirical research.

When all of the sources were read and their relevant information was catalogued under the appropriate substantive areas, an elementary form of content analysis was followed. This consisted of adding up the number of sources that reported a particular characteristic (e.g., "Americans are materialistic."). The resulting scores were then compared to the scores that the other characteristics had received. The characteristics that showed the highest scores were tentatively accepted as being the most reliable. In other words, the valued characteristics receiving the highest scores were deemed the complexes which most probably exist in American culture. These resulting value-complexes or (value-centered orientations) make up the core of this draft.

We have explained what this draft is about, and the methodological considerations involved in its production. It remains to enumerate the several qualifications or limitations that result from the brevity and high generality of the report.

First, the draft is concerned only with contemporary American culture. The year 1945 was chosen as a beginning date because it marks the end of the period of "total war" and because it leaves a manageable span of time. Consequently, the statements which follow are time-bound to the recent past.

The reader must also be cautioned about the geographic limitations placed upon the information. All statements are claimed to apply only within the general continental limits of the United States. Some of the statements may also apply to certain areas of Canada, especially those in close cultural contiguity, but such a proposition is no more than a topic for investigation.

There are, of course, regional differences within this geographic area. However, as the purpose of the draft is to provide a general summary of American culture, the regional differences have not been dealt with.

A number of other sources of variation should be considered, particularly the variations resulting from ethnic or racial minorities, socioeconomic classes, and subcultures, as well as the demographic variables of sex, age, and religious or political groupings. The statements which follow do not take into account variation resulting from these possible sources.

One might object that these limitations result in information too general to be of any use at all. Granted, such information would have limited use for specific concerns such as casework. Yet even in these instances, generalized information is useful in setting the limits within which one can work. In all cultures there is a general "cultural base," whose variations can be treated as reciprocal adaptations between the cultural base and a local situation. It has been well established that such culture-wide common ground exists, and that it differs from one culture to another.[1]

The purpose of this work, then, is to integrate the pertinent source materials into a usable summary of contemporary American culture. It is left to others to specify the source, direction and extent of the variations within the culture.

---

[1] See for example Edward T. Hall. The Hidden Dimension. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1966, for differing reactions and attitudes in the matter of spatial relationships.

I.A THE VALUE SYSTEM

by Thomas L. Van Valey
and Howard L. Nostrand

Introduction to the essay on the Value System 11

1. Achievement-success 12

    Competition

2. Materialism 15

3. Practicality-efficiency............................. 15

    Rationality

4. Future orientation 16

    A. Progress

    B. Change (assumption or value)

5. A delimited equalitarianism 17

    A. Equal opportunity

    B. A humanitarian spirit (Golden Rule)............

6. Conformism.. 19

    A. Compliance

    B. Shared values

7. Self-reliance 19

    A. Individualism

    B. Creativity

8. Speculative comments 21

INTRODUCTION TO THE ESSAY ON THE VALUE SYSTEM

A discussion of values or a value system should be prefaced by some definition of the term "value." Throughout this text, values are defined as any things, attributes, or characteristics perceived as desirable.

In addition to defining the concept, it is necessary to say whose values are to be described. Without such delimitation, the term is a concept with no relation to reality. This essay will deal only with values that apply throughout American culture. Individual values and those of groups within the nation will be mentioned only as they serve to clarify the more generalized values.

We have chosen a series of "value-centered orientations" which seem to be characteristic of contemporary American culture. This term has the advantage of embracing a number of value-laden attributes or characteristics surrounding one value-theme. The term thus makes it possible to generalize about numerous similar characteristics under one broad topic.

The following diagram and explanation will clarify the relationships between the value-centered orientations, the more specific values that may be regarded either as components or as derivatives of the general orientations, and the related assumptions concerning the nature of man and the world.

Level 4. INTEGRATION OF THE VALUE-CENTERED ORIENTATIONS
Level 3. ASSUMPTIONS
Level 2. VALUE-CENTERED ORIENTATIONS
Level 1. DERIVATIVE VALUES

Level 1. Derivative values

This level of abstraction consists of all valued characteristics attributable to individuals, groups, sub-cultures. Examples are "God-fearing," "progressive." Such attributes are desirable but are not valued throughout the culture.

Level 2. Value-centered orientations

This level consists of value-complexes formed by similar derivative values surrounding a more generalized value-theme, such as ashievement-success. Examples of derivative values subsumed under this value-theme are "competition," "patriotism," or "bigness." The present essay is primarily concerned with the description of the value-centered orientations.

Level 3. Assumptions

Assumptions are basically those widespread but culture-specific beliefs regarding topics on the order of "the nature of existence," or "the nature of man." This level contains even more generalized abstractions than level 2. The assumptions precede the value-orientations in the sense that they already exist, while the orientations are objectives toward which the culture-bearers are striving.

Level 4. Integration of the value-centered orientations

This is the highest and most generalized level of abstraction involved in the present study of American culture. It organizes the value-centered orientations into a single structure. The concepts generated here are so abstract as to be of only limited use. Nonetheless, the relationships provide the observer with reference points from which he can work. The value-centered orientations do not exist separated from one another, but complexly interrelated, and in a state of balance. Any over-balancing may result in conflict.

Questions concerning the balance and interrelation among the orientations will be considered in a final summary.

The following value-centered orientations have been observed in American behavior throughout the country's history, and by differing types of person, from the trained observer, commentator, or student of culture, to the casual visitor.

1. Achievement-success

The first orientation centers around the simple premise that, "everyone in the American Dream has the right, and often the duty, to try to succeed and to do his best to reach the top."[1] This statement makes explicit two dimensions of achievement-success. The first is the right of individuals to try to succeed. It involves the question of equality, which will be discussed later under "A Delimited Equalitarianism." The other dimension, that of the duty of each American to attempt to succeed, perpetuates something of the Calvinistic undertone prevalent in earlier American history.

These two dimensions together impose a cultural expectation on every American. He should at least try to make a success of himself in some field of endeavor, be it biochemistry or barrell-jumping. Whether he does succeed or not depends on external circumstances as well as on his own capabilities. But regardless of the degree to which he succeeds, he is still respected if he tries. The small businessman, who never quite "makes it big," as long as he works hard, pays his bills, and leads a respectable personal life, will gain the respect of his friends and associates.

Merely trying to succeed, however, does not win the greatest prestige. The person admired most in the American culture is one who works hard, is honest (at least visibly so), and does succeed, especially if he has "worked his way up from the bottom." Both the small businessman and the Horatio Alger hero are respected in American culture, but it is the latter who is valued more.

One of the major components of the achievement-success orientation is that of competition. "Our society has been (and is) highly competitive--a society in which ascribed status in the form of fixed, hereditary social stratification has been minimized."[2] Thus, in American culture

> Parents train children to compete for success--in school, in sports, and in social life; and they anxiously review their own records as parents, com-

---

1. W. L. Warner, Marchai Meeker, and Kenneth Eells. Social Class in America. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949; New York: Harper and Brothers, Harper Torchbooks, 1960, p. 3.

2. Robin Williams, 1960, p. 417.

> paring themselves in this way, as in every other, with their friends and enemies.[3]

Competition, then, can assume many different forms. It can involve one's own present achievements, those of one's friends and associates, different types of achievement (academic, athletic, social, financial), even competition with one's own past. Competition in one form or another pervades the whole of American behavior.

Another component related to the general orientation, and suggested by the discussion of competition is that of mobility. In interpersonal competition someone must win and someone must lose. This results in mobility, either upward, downward, or both. The competition in American culture therefore entails a corresponding degree of mobility. Walter Goldschmidt has gone so far as to say, "The American culture is built upon mobility: historical, geographical, philosophical, economic, social."[4]

A final component of the achievement-success orientation is the value placed on "bigness." This is a rather minor derivative value, but it does merit discussion.

In American society, "...'better' is presumed to be implied by 'bigger'"[5] Thus the folk saying, "the bigger the better"--a notion that applies to numbers as well as size. Americans have more material goods than any other people: their standard of living is higher; more of them own (or are trying to own) more material possessions; even the buildings and structures are larger or more numerous than in other countries. These are simply examples, for the spectrum of evidence is

---

3. J. P. Spiegel. "Conflicting formal and informal roles in newly acculturated families," in Research Publications, Association for Research in Nervous and Mental Disease, vol. 42, 1964, p. 309.

4. Walter Goldschmidt. "Social class and the dynamics of status in America," in The American Anthropologist, vol. 57, 1955, p. 1213.

5. Williams, 1960, p. 427.

broad. In sum, many Americans tend to perceive quantity as a substitute for quality, so that achievement and success are often translated into a desire to amass a quantity--of money, land, power, or even friends.[6]

2. Materialism

This orientation has long been thought of as "typically American"; whether rightly so is a difficult question to answer. There are a few notions which may prove illuminating.

When "materialism" is used by a non-American author, it usually carries a negative connotation. To some outside observers American materialism appears to be an almost compulsive desire to accumulate wealth, objects, whether they have a purpose or not. In other words, Americans seem to view the acquisition of material goods as an end in itself.

This characterization is accurate for some cases. Historically, the American "entrepreneurs" or "robber barons" have invited just such a description. However, it would not be accurate to say that most Americans behave in this manner. In reality only a highly visible few are compulsive accumulators.

In contrast to the negative opinion is the notion that most Americans view the acquisition of material goods as a means to other ends. The majority of Americans see material goods, money and gadgets as symbols of the actual goal--success thought of in terms of power and/or prestige.[7] On this view, the American is indeed motivated to acquire material possessions, but the possessions have value only as proof to others, and to the American himself, that he has achieved, succeeded.

3. Practicality-efficiency

The core value or central theme of this major orientation can best be expressed in the questions..."What good is it?" or "What does it do?" or "Is it any better than...?" A new method, technique, idea or process is no good unless it is better than the previous one--and the criterion for judgment is efficiency or practicality.

---

[6] See the discussion of the materialism orientation for elaboration of this topic.

[7] Kluckhohn, 1963, pp. 228-261.

Americans have harassed and ridiculed "the dreamer," "the idealist," and respected or even idolized "the pragmatist" and "the man who gets things done." Efficiency

> "is a word of high praise in a society that has long emphasized adaptability, technological innovation, economic expansion, up-to-dateness, practicality, expediency, 'getting things done.'"[8]

Subsumed under this orientation is a less important value, the belief in rationality and logic, linked with a distrust of anti-empirical or non-empirical methods.[9]

Science in general is valued highly, and is understood to mean a rational approach to questions and problems. Few value superstition or magic: the anti-empirical, non-empirical, and irrational. There is no doubt that this value and its more generalized correlate are characteristic of America.

4. Future orientation

"In the beginning America was promise, rather than past; hope, rather than accomplishment."[10] The orientation of the American people has always been to the future. The past and present were the times for the people who stayed in Europe; America was the "the land of opportunity" where the focus was upon the future.

In contemporary America the direction is still forward. The culture continues to emphasize progress, especially progress through scientific and technical development; it reinforces the American's optimism about future potentialities, both his own and his nation's. Thus,

---

[8] Williams, 1960, p. 428.

[9] Franz Adler. "The Value Concept in Sociology." American Journal of Sociology, vol. 62, 1956, p. 275.

[10] Williams, 1960, p. 433

> ...In America changes are continually taking place, and there is a belief that they should take place. For the most part, there is a high evaluation of change, because changes in the eyes of Americans usually are for the better. Indeed, some Americans apparently believe that change is a good thing in and of itself.[11]

Upon examination, the future orientation is found to be a complex of several minor derivative values. These include adaptability, "boosterism," optimism, a strong receptivity to change (ordinarily understood to be synonymous with progress), and a faith in the perfectability of the common man--in time.[12] These values differ from one another, yet they are all based on the notion of change over time. This raises an important question: Is the future orientation truly a value-centered orientation, or is it rather an assumption of fact, upon which these derivative values and others are based? The answer appears to be that the future orientation is both a value and an assumption. In the value sense, it implies that people should not attempt to hinder progress for the sake of tradition or the status quo. Thus, as a value, the future is a direction toward which all individuals, groups, and social systems should direct themselves. The future orientation's character as an assumption was suggested a moment ago when it was said that the derivative values were all based on the notion of change over time. Movement, the basic ingredient of change, is not immediate but must develop as time passes, making the future of yesterday the present of today and the past of tomorrow.

5. A delimited equalitarianism

"In the bright glow and warm presence of the American Dream all men are born free and equal."[13] This statement manages to catch the flavor of equalitarianism in America. It is correct that the American creed has been based upon the premise that all men are created equal. But contemporary American culture is hardly the expression of complete equality. American equalitarianism is not that simple.

---

[11] Graham, 1957, p. 139.

[12] Williams, 1960, p. 432

[13] W. L. Warner, Marchai Meeker, and Kenneth Eells. Social Class in America. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949.--New York: Harper and Brothers, Harper Torchbooks, 1960, p. 3

The rationale of American equalitarianism is composed of two main premises. The first, which might be labelled "a humanitarian spirit," is that each individual has inherent worth as a human being. In keeping with the Christian ethic, "...all individuals are spiritually equal, regardless of their material differences."[14]

A second premise, that all persons should have equality of opportunity, may be stated as follows:

> ...the difference at the start shall not be due to involuntary social factors. As long as there is some opportunity to advance, as long as the ideal is practiced to some extent, every person can hope to get ahead, and this hope will have a powerful effect on behavior. No one can deny that the son of a truck driver has some chance of becoming a distinguished scientist. If he exerts enough effort, he may in fact beat out the doctor's son. Indeed, in our philosophy the less the opportunity, the greater is the merit or success.[15]

The second premise differs from the first in that it does not assume men to be created equal. In fact, it is based upon the assumption that there are individual differences in emotional strength, intellectual endowment, and the like, so that all persons should have the same opportunity to proceed to the limits of their respective, individual capabilities.[16]

---

[14] Davis, Bredemeir, and Levy, 1949, p. 696.

[15] Ibid., p. 103

[16] It may be noted that this second premise can easily be distorted into a rationale for inequality of opportunity, through the notion concerning divergent individual capabilities. This can be twisted into the notion that one particular group or race is the most highly developed and should have greater opportunity, since it can go farther.

6. Conformism

This orientation has been given increasing attention over the last two or three decades. Some authors have implied that the United States is becoming a "nation of conformists." Some have postulated a counter-trend encroaching upon the time-worn value of self-reliance or individualism (to be discussed in the next section). Others, notably David Riesman, point to a composite of several different elements.

The present study tends to support the latter of the above "theories," in essence if not substance. The literature indicates that there are at least two major dimensions to the conformism orientation: "compliance" and "shared values."

Compliancy, "going along with the crowd," is the aspect of conformism implied in statements that the United States is becoming a nation of conformists. There is much evidence that this is a predominant theme in contemporary American society, especially in the metropolis. Here, among large numbers of persons, unrelated and uninterested in one another, the individual finds himself an anonymous figure known only to a small circle of friends and associates. In this situation, without the personal and community relations of the rural or suburban areas, he adopts an impersonal mode of interaction and associations, sometimes by choice but more often by necessity. With the decline of the close personal relationships of childhood, one finds it easy to immerse oneself in the mass of the city and to conform, at least outwardly, to the majority patterns.[17]

The "shared values" dimension is somewhat different. In this case, one still "goes along with the crowd" but not through necessity or because of social pressure. One conforms because one shares similar values and interests with his associates. This type of conformity, as contrasted to compliancy, does not run counter to self-reliance or individualism, since conformity is chosen by the individual as a basis for his association and interaction with others.

7. Self-reliance

The fundamental principle of this last orientation is

---

17. Boyd and Worchester, 1964, p. 340.

the right of each person to make his own decisions.[18] Self-reliance is the belief that every individual has the inalienable right to do as he wishes, within certain moral and legal limits. The ideal is proclaimed that every man is a kingdom unto himself, and that the invasion of his privacy, or interference with his integrity, is morally detestable.[19] It is in connection with this theme that the American "rejection of authority" postulated by Gorer seems to find its place: figures in authority are those most able to force an individual along a course of action to which he is opposed.

The self-reliance orientation is closely related to the achievement-success orientation. Not only is it important to achieve success, but it is necessary to do so through one's own initiative, not through the efforts of others. Wolfenstein and Leites have expressed this thought in their study of the major plot configurations of American films:

> Winning is terrifically important and always possible though it may be a tough fight. The conflict is not an internal one; it is not our own impulses which endanger us nor our own scruples that stand in our way. The hazards are all external, but they are not rooted in the nature of life itself. They are the hazards of a particular situation with which we find ourselves confronted. The hero...is still able to beat the other fellow to the punch...if he relies on no one but himself...[20]

The defining of self-reliance raises the question of the place of creativity in contemporary American culture. That quality has always been highly valued in the culture as a personal talent. Not only Americans but most peoples doubtless respect, admire or even envy the creative individual. Most

---

[18] Davis, Bredemeir and Levy, 1949, p. 700.

[19] Geoffroy Gorer, The American People, A Study in National Character, New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1948, p. 30.

[20] Martha Wolfenstein and Nathan Leites. Movies: A Psychological Study, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1950, p. 298.

Americans, apparently, perceive creativity as a personal characteristic and not as something that can be achieved by groups or social systems.

Creativity is felt to be an expression of an individual's imagination, a "God-given" or innate talent possessed by only a few. Since the creative spark is thought of as something generated outside the province of human will and reason there is a tendency, even among those who do not enjoy certain sorts of art, to accept any expression of "a creative spirit" as having some value, or at least as deserving tolerance, even if it achieves nothing for practical use. The self-reliance orientation may thus conflict with that of practicality-efficiency. And indeed it is precisely the possibility of a conflict of values that shows the presence of two distinguishable value-orientations.

8. Speculative comments

This section is devoted to topics, questions, or predictions which have too little supportive evidence to warrant inclusion in the text of the essay. They refer to one or more of the orientations alleged, or to others that may develop as time passes.

One speculation relates to the current controversy over the degree to which the "duty" aspect of achievement-success applies in contemporary American culture. Questions to raise are: "What conditions have historically reinforced the duty of individuals to succeed and to what degree are these conditions still present? What else is present in the culture that might cause the devaluation of the 'duty obligation' of achievement-success?"

Also related to the achievement-success orientation is the question of the value ascribed to national achievement. This has often been expressed during the past two decades as a "Beat-the-Communists" value. Some trends presented in evidence of this value are the following: the upgrading of education, especially in the technical and scientific areas; the criticism directed at various federal, state, and local programs; and the moneys channelled into foreign aid, "the war on poverty," military defense, and so on. Whether or not national achievement is gaining in prominence and distinctness as a value is still questionable. It may be only subordinate manifestation of the achievement-success orientation.

With reference to the materialism orientation one might ask, Why are many labor unions striking not for higher wages but for "fringe benefits" such as retirement plans, health insurance and better working conditions? Why is so much attention given by the Federal Government and other agencies to "security," -- financial, social, and medical?

In considering such questions one may wonder if materialism is going out of style, to be replaced by "security-ism" or even "leisureism." One may also suggest, however, that materialism may be a much broader topic than has been thought.

Finally, a question is raised as to the coherence of the equalitarianism orientation within which two dimensions were noted: a humanitarian spirit, and equality of opportunity. The point can be made that these two dimensions stand in opposition to each other in actual practice. One can also contend that the second is nothing more than a rationalized expansion of the first. In any event, the ideal of equalitarianism in America certainly does not explain the presence of discrimination and racial conflict. These conflict with the professed ideal, and must be taken into account either as expressions of other major themes in the culture or as "institutionalized subterfuges" in areas of conflict between major themes.

I. C. ASSUMPTIONS IN AMERICAN CULTURE

by Robert K. Leik
and Thomas L. Van Valey

Introduction: Ground-of-Meaning Assumptions

The Assumptions:

page

1. The Universe Is Mechanistic 25
2. Man Can Become the Master of the Universe 25
3. Man Is Basically Rational and Reasoning...28
4. All Men Have Inherent Worth..............29
5. Men Are Improvable..............30
6. The American System Is the Best Yet Developed..............40

Speculative Comments: An Assumption Concerning the Future of Man..........41

Introduction: Ground of Meaning Assumptions

In the introduction to the value system, it was proposed that assumptions be defined as those beliefs, conscious and overt, or unconscious and covert, which are basic to a culture-bearer's notions of reality. It was further postulated that these are more general in nature than are the value-centered orientations. These two statements are very broad and consequently require some specification and explanation.

I.C. Assumptions

The problematic aspect of the first point is the notion that assumptions (beliefs about something) can be either conscious and overt or unconscious and covert. We are saying here that the basis of one's behavior may at times be purposively derived from consciously recognized premises. At other times it may be an unquestioned consequence of beliefs which are so seldom openly examined that they pervade one's actions without his being aware of their presence or effects. Probably were someone to be questioned in detail about why he behaves as he does, he could be led to recognize many of these unconscious assumptions.

A related issue is the rationality, or lack of it, of the assumptions upon which behavior is based. To people of different backgrounds, each other's cultural assumptions may seem obviously inaccurate, hence necessarily irrational. To question rationality, however, implies an objective basis from which to evaluate; and the nature of cultural assumptions is that they appear to the members of that culture to be such an objective basis.

The important issue is not to determine whether assumptions are conscious or unconscious, rational or irrational, but to determine what are the most common assumptions underlying American behavior, and how they interact with the values outlined previously. Certain assumptions that are typical cross-culturally might illustrate the nature of what is meant by ground-of-meaning assumptions, making subsequent discussion clearer.

One common assumption in most cultures is that marriage (in whatever form prevails in the culture) is the "natural" state for adults.

This is not just to say that marriage is more fun, or implies better citizenship, but that as a matter of course it occurs in the lives of people. Another common assumption is that objects such as trees, bushes, or grass do not think or feel (as humans do), hence they may be cut, trimmed, mowed, etc., without that type of behavior being called cruel. Reflection on the above illustrations should convince the reader that they are certainly not objective fact, yet they affect in great measure the way that values operate in actual behavior.

To adequately consider common American ground-of-meaning assumptions it will be preferable to separate the discussion into two parts. First, five basic assumptions will be presented, with some attention to more general implications of each. Then an attempt will be made to demonstrate how the specific assumptions and their implications provide a peculiarly American interpretation of the values stated earlier. The uniqueness of a culture lies not so much in the general values espoused, since many of these are widely shared by other cultures, but rather in the particular shaping and delimiting of those values by the assumptions underlying everyday application of them.

ASSUMPTION 1. The Universe Is Mechanistic

ASSUMPTION 2. Man Can Become Master of the Universe

These two assumptions are so interrelated that they are more readily discussed jointly. The remark that "Man is expected to triumph in any contest with Nature, in accordance with the optimistic confidence in the power of science and technology,"[1] nicely illustrates the assumption most often mentioned as characteristic of contemporary culture. It rests upon the belief that the universe is conquerable, and that through concentrated action, man will be able to gain complete control of his environment.

The American, therefore, does believe that it is possible to subdue the forces of nature and turn them toward his needs and wishes. However, at the same time, he also realizes that this can be accomplished only through persistent and organized effort. Generally speaking, the universe is thought of as a machine rather than as a mystical entity acting upon man. It is simply a collection of stars, planets and other heavenly bodies acting in accordance with the laws of physics, and not a fancy of a "fickle and unpredictable fate."

Americans also view the world itself in material terms, so that sub-human organisms and inanimate objects often are seen only as raw materials to be fashioned for human use. To most of us, then, the environment is only the basic ingredient for man's cookbook, and not the final result.

Such materialism has been severely judged. Critics, particularly during the last two decades, have condemned the American because he uses other people as well as the inanimate and the sub-human. These critics say that America is a nation of users, a nation in which a hierarchy of "power-wielders" treats the average man simply as an object to be used when needed, and discarded when outmoded or worn out.

---

[1] J.P. Spiegel, "Conflicting Formal and Informal Roles in Newly Acculturated Families," Research Publications, Association for Research in Nervous and Mental Disease, vol. 42, 1964, p. 310.

The above, however, is exaggerated. It is easy to conceive of the user. He is the "status seeker," the "man who made it to the top, using his friends for stair steps." Although such a characterization does not fit most Americans, it is probably true that the tendency to view the natural and social environment as manipulable is greater in the United States than in most other countries.

As a consequence of the materialism fostered by the above assumptions, the acquisition of material goods is valued highly, both as a means to the power and prestige which they represent and also for the sheer comfort and security in having them. Similarly, Americans who possess such values find it only natural to strive for their success in terms of material goods, rather than in terms of, e.g., knowledge or religious well-being, as other cultures at various times have stressed. The anthropologist Clyde Kluckhohn has stated "This has been (and is) a business civilization--not a military, ecclesiastical, or scholarly one."[2]

Implied by the assumption that mastery is possible is a belief in man's self-determination. From the earliest times, philosophers have debated whether man is self-determinate and dependent only upon his own resources and talents. Although Americans are little concerned with any particular doctrine or philosophy, they generally assume that man is self-determinate, at least to the degree that he is able to affect his own

---

2. Kluckhohn, 1963, p. 197.

destiny. Arthur Schlesinger has said, "The American character...is bottomed upon the conviction that nothing in the world is beyond its power to accomplish."[3]

ASSUMPTION 3: Man Is Basically Rational and Reasoning.

Americans do, on the whole, believe that man is a "rational animal," and would agree that all normally functioning individuals are rational: i.e. endowed with some measure of intelligence, good judgment, reason, and common sense. Moreover, most Americans believe that, when presented with a reasonable argument, based upon known and verifiable facts, any individual is capable of reaching a conclusion substantially in accordance with the facts presented. This is not to say that Americans believe that there is only one answer to any group of facts, regardless of the way in which it is presented. Rather, it means that "...in the long run we tend to select the more rationally tenable concept or action and to reject the less tenable."[4] A Fulton, an Edison, an Einstein may be scoffed at for a while by some. Yet if they are correct, they will be accepted sooner or later.

---

3. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., "What Then Is The American, This New Man?", American Historical Review, vol. 48, 1943, p. 244.
4. H.L. Nostrand, "Some Elements for the Synthesis of a Contemporary Culture," Main Currents in Modern Thought, vol. 7, No. 3, 1949, p. 82.

ASSUMPTION 4: All Men Have Some Inherent Worth

This assumption is closely related to several of the others under discussion. It means that every human being has some worth to some other person, persons, or the society as a whole. In the legal sense the assumption is made explicit in attempts to define all men as equal before the law. The assertion that "all men are created equal" is a common one, and has had considerable influence in development of American legal philosophy. In everyday terms, however, Americans are realistic enough to recognize that not all men have the same social, economic or moral worth. Different men have different abilities, talents, capacities for kindness, generosity, warmth, and affection. Some are great physicists, some are artists, and some are bricklayers, plumbers, or small businessmen. Yet, it is not only a man's occupation that determines his worth, it is the way in which he interacts with others. In a great measure, it is how he treats his family, and every other person he has contact with.

Robin Williams summarizes the Americans' acceptance of one another as follows.

> America has always impressed observers from more rigid and hierarchical societies as being marked by an extraordinary informality, directness, and lack of status consciousness in person-to-person contacts. This general openness of social relations can only be maintained in a culture in which intrinsic personal value is a widespread and effective assumption.[5]

Another aspect of this major ground-of-meaning assumption is the way in which it connects with

---

[5] Williams, 1960, pp. 440-441.

American notions of equality. To put it simply (at the risk of over-simplification), in American society, men view one another as being essentially equal.[6] The subordination of one individual to another is morally repugnant to most Americans and in many areas is legally forbidden. Consequently, individuals tend to view one another as being located on essentially the same (or at least similar) horizontal plane. This phenomenon is undoubtedly related to factors which have made the United States basically a middle-class society.

(A difference can be noted here between this American assumption and its European or Latin-American counterpart, which is diametrically opposed to it. In many other cultures individuals typically perceive others as occupying stations in life inherently above or below theirs, rather than a horizontal plane.)

ASSUMPTION 5. Men Are Improvable.

This assumption is the simplest to explain. It implies only that man has an extraordinary potential for development, far beyond what he has thus far demonstrated. How far he will be able to progress is, of course, unknown. Even so, the American people believe that man will eventually rid himself of the "human frailties"--greed, dishonesty, avarice, hate, and so on. It should be made clear, however, that such progress can only occur over time and through the persistent efforts of all men.

---

6. The reader should be reminded here of the qualifications that were placed on this proposition in the Introduction.

Connected with the assumption of man's improvability is another notion concerned with the condition of the human animal at time of birth (re: his innate "goodness" or "evil").

Again, as with other notions of similar generality (and non-verifiability), philosophers have, throughout history, debated about the "nature of man." In contrast to the previous assumption regarding man's mastery of the universe and the accompanying philosophical question of his self-determinacy, in this case American culture takes a more compromising position. They "...believe that children are born neither Good nor Evil but Neutral. How they turn out depends upon the nature of the parents' relation with the child."[7]

Consequently, this assumption and its concomitant notion regarding the "neutral" character of humankind further reinforce the American belief in the future and man's place in it. It simply concludes (a priori) that since the outcome of all children is the responsibility of their parents and the result of their ministrations, if mankind can find the "right" way to rear them, the children and the children's children can some day claim the heritage of all mankind.

The five ground-of-meaning assumptions which have been briefly stated can now be more closely linked to the values common to Americans.. In the process certain derivative assumptions and values will be discussed which sharpen the picture of the culture of the United States.

---

7. J.P. Spiegel. "Conflicting Formal and Informal Roles in Newly Acculturated Families," Research Publications Association for Research in Nervous and Mental Disease, Vol. 42, 1964, p. 310.

Combining the first three assumptions (mechanistic and masterable universe, rational nature of man), we can note the following logical extensions.

a. *Achievement is the result of rational behavior rather than of fate.* This places responsibility for one's success or failure on himself alone. It is clear, however, from the extensive popularization of Freudian psychology, that this assumption is at times a hard taskmaster.

b. *Pragmatic, hence scientific prodedures and technology are superior to all other procedures and technologies.* The value of practicality-efficiency is of course closely related to this assumption.

c. *Education is the key to science and technology, hence the key to achievement.* There may be questions raised about the curriculum, the physical plant, the extra-curricular activities, etc., but seldom is the utility of education for the entire population seriously questioned.

d. *Achievement brings material goods, hence material goods are indicative of a successful person.*

These assumptions, and the ones which generated them, lead to a variety of more specific values when combined with the high value placed on achievement-success *per se*. Since the extent to which one set of values takes precedence over, or is limited by, other values is basic to understanding any culture, some indication of the range of each derivative value is included.

a. *Everyone should be willing to try to achieve, regardless of need.* This value is most evident in pressures on school aged children to do well so that they may go on to high-status positions as adults. The value is limited by emphasis on friendliness and equalitarianism.

A person should not do so well that his classmates or fellow workers are made to look bad by comparison. Furthermore, a person (or business enterprise) should not be allowed to achieve to the extent that others' well-being is seriously affected. When there is no economic need to achieve, the person should either temper his success with helping others or he should seek avenues of achievement which have more widely shared benefits, such as civic leadership.

b. People should be economically independent. This is obviously related to the value of self-reliance and is evident even in the sphere of the family. Children are eager to leave home and establish themselves independently (usually financially as well as socially), and aged are encouraged to maintain their own separate residences rather than live with their children's families. Further, as the equalitarian value indicates, one is to be less admired for inherited wealth or status than for that which his own efforts have accumulated. The chief exception to this derivative value pertains to wives and young children, although many wives maintain partial economic independence through work outside the home.

c. Everyone should be educated according to his capacity. The value placed on education is largely a consequence of the assumption that better educated people are better able to achieve and to govern themselves. This creates the problem, however, of whether an individual might spend too many years in school, hence put off being a contributor to the economic system. Also, individual capacity is both difficult to assess and a potential basis for invidious comparisons (the latter violates the equalitarian value). Consequently, a more common expression of the value of education is that everyone should receive at least a high school education, or at least two years of college. Some even advocate a college degree for all. It has been suggested with some seriousness that an increasingly technologically complex future may require post graduate training for most people.

d. Status should be based on demonstrated achievement. Two areas of value conflict are apparent here. One is that status distinctions of whatever kind are contrary to an equalitarian ethic. There is a general feeling that the person who spends all his time working is too narrow and is a threat to those whose lives are not so totally devoted to status striving. As a result, such a person may be accorded respect and perhaps envy, for his achievements, but he is not likely to be considered a model citizen.

The second conflict concerns the right to retain the benefits of one's achievements and to pass these on to one's family. Inherited wealth is a source of status. Much debate has occurred ragarding this question, with a gradual growth in policies which reduce the ease of passing status to one's heirs by inheritance only.

e. Authority is legitimate to the extent that it promotes efficient achievement. Obviously such a derivative value is relevant to a production oriented society, yet it can easily run counter to other values. In particular, the value of individualism causes highly regimented behavior to be onerous. Although regimen may contribute to efficiency, the person whose policies require it is frequently thought to be exceeding the legitimate bounds of his authority. Even so traditionally regimented an organization as the army is often accused of exceeding authority via over-emphasis on efficiency to the exclusion of human concerns.

f. Bigness (size, wealth, power) is desirable. If material possessions, status and authority indicate achievement, and achievement is desirable, then the accumulation of these indicators is desirable. Again equalitarian-humanitarian values come into play in asserting that ostentatious display of wealth or power is inappropriate and that too great a variation in these aspects of society is disruptive.

In the area of interpersonal relations, the assumption that all men have some inherent worth and the open informality produced by an equalitarian value lead to the following derivative assumptions.

a. Most people are inherently likeable.

b. Friendliness is the key to successful interpersonal relations.

Subsidiary values which derive from the above include:

a. People should be accepted and appreciated interpersonally for what they are (in a personal-worth sense) rather than for what they do or who they are. As a consequence of this value there is generally less concern for social form in America than elsewhere. Social blunders and ineptitude are often considered irrelevant and excusable. Obviously such a value runs counter to status based on ability and achievement. The most difficult area of application of this value is in personal relations between, e.g., employer and employee; that is, where the economic based achievement values are appropriate at the same time that status-less, humanitarian values are also pertinent.

b. Questions of rank or status should not enter into social relations. It is likely that, due to this type of value, relationships between people of different classes in America are more awkward than in those countries where class deference is assumed. In consequence, it might be expected that contact among people of different classes is much less likely than our equalitarian ethic would imply. Such contact is too apt to be problematical for all concerned.

c. The only legitimate authority in interpersonal relations is consensus.

d. People should express friendliness by liking and doing what others like and do. These two derivative values operate to produce a standardized kind of social life, giving a conformistic character to much interpersonal behavior. Of course, the individualism so apparent in relation to achievement is contrary to "getting along with everybody."

The above comments should help to focus the discrepancy between those values having to do with achievement, practicality and individualism versus those pertaining to equalitarianism, informality, joining many voluntary associations, and even conformism. The one set of values derives from, and is primarily relevant to the economic sphere. It of course pervades education to the extent that education is seen as preparation for later productivity. It also influences voluntary associations and interpersonal relations to the extent that the context of behavior is one of accomplishing a specifiable task. In short, these values are usually paramount when some type of task orientation is the basis for behavior.

On the other hand, the second set of values pertains to the enjoyment of other people's company and one's own activity. The superficial conformity of fads in clothing and entertainment, for example, simply makes easier an assumption of similarity of interests and values on which equalitarian friendship may be based.

Each sphere limits the applicability of the other; their joint applicability may cause strains in interpersonal relationships and inefficiency in task accomplishment. It is common advice to wives of businessmen to avoid their husband's place of business, since his role as businessman is not readily compatable with his role as husband.

It might prove useful to compare the task and social spheres more systematically. The following chart, which indicates comparable components of behavior in each sphere, is necessarily over-simplified. Many areas of behavior are not easily categorized as task or social.

	Sphere of Behavior	
	Task	Social
Success is defined as:	Achievement	Personal acceptance
and is measurable by:	Wealth, Power Prestige	Popularity
Behavior is governed by:	Practicality-efficiency	Equalitarianism
which leads to:	Competition	Superficial conformism
Time orientation is:	Future	Present

Confusions between these spheres arise increasingly in American culture due to the fact that the era of the individual economic entrepreneur is rapidly giving way to one of complex organizations in which interpersonal manipulation becomes institutionalized as a major aspect of overall task accomplishment.

A final area of consideration is that pertaining to the rights and duties of governmental authority, or more generally, to the maintenance of social order. The assumption that people are capable of rational, hence responsible behavior, coupled with the value of equalitarianism results in the conviction that *the basis of social order should be mutual consent*. This value clearly underlies our entire government system. A related derivative assumption which Americans hold is that *a constitutional democracy is superior to all other governmental forms*. The term "democracy" may be used when a republican form is meant. Associated with the above values and assumptions are a set of derivative values.

a. *Authority for any governing process should rest in the will of the people and be exercised by elected representatives*. This principle is so strongly held that even informal voluntary associations are likely to develop elective government. The chief obstacle to application of the value lies in the frequent inefficiency of elected representatives and officials, particularly since wide personal acceptance (social success) may count more than demonstrated achievement (task success) in an election. As a consequence of the dilemma, many aspects of government are bureaucratized; that is, they employ people according to ability demonstrated in qualifying examinations to perform specified tasks in the more complex governmental system. Such civil service appointees are always in some way subject to a higher elective executive or representative body, however, maintaining the spirit of the value.

b. Rights and responsibilities of government should reside at the most immediate governmental level unless conditions demand otherwise. The desire to maintain control over governmental process is undoubtedly basic to this value. Large, centralized government is too remote and too impersonal to appear subject to much control. Therefore a rather inefficient system of overlapping local governmental units has been maintained and will no doubt continue to be maintained. The problem of efficiency is of course the chief limitation to completely local rule.

c. Individual rights should take precedence over "collective good" except for grave situations involving, e.g., national security or community health. Because individual rights often imply protecting those who are different and uncooperative, others who value achievement and efficiency more highly are likely to find civil liberties issues frustrating. Similarly, social conformity is often at odds with the concept of individual liberty. There is, therefore, continual concern and frequent litigation over the boundary between these major values.

One further aspect of American culture derives from the assumptions and values pertaining to time and its use. Whether in the task or the social sphere, Americans are concerned with doing, becoming, creating; not only regarding occupation, but in sports, hobbies, voluntary associations, etc. Even retirement is a negative concept unless it is viewed as an opportunity to engage in activities previously obstructed by occupational demands. This activeness plus a general optimism produces assumptions that:

a. Things will change, usually for the better.

b. Youth is a time of excitement and promise; the best years of life. Such an emphasis on activeness leads to some avoidance of, even distrust of contemplative activities.

Underlying the entire value system is a conviction that the individual is the basic referent of behavior, not the group or the collectivity. Although there is an often noted change from "rugged individualism" to "adjustment" the emphasis is still on the individual; adjustment is for his needs or purposes, not necessarily for the good of the group.

Although it is not quite the same type of assumption as the first five ground-of-meaning assumptions which began this chapter, one more widespread assumption of Americans should be noted.

ASSUMPTION 6. The American System Is the Best Yet Developed.

This assumption is probably the most conscious and overt of the American's beliefs about his country and its culture. It is, as social scientists have labelled it, ethnocentrism, "...the point of view that one's way of life is to be preferred to all others."[8] It is common to all known cultures, and even to many smaller groups.

---

[8] Melville J. Herskovits, Cultural Anthropology, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960, p. 356.

The content of this assumption, as defined above, needs no explanation. However, since this assumption is known to many segments of the culture, one might ask how the American can honestly profess it, knowing its true nature and origin. The answer is simple. The American, when questioned, will simply say "Look at the facts." They show that the United States is the richest, most advanced, and most progressive country that the world has ever known. He can say "what other country has never lost a major war?" or "What other country has ever had more conveniences for its inhabitants?"

All of this is simply to show that the American, even fully cognizant of the ethnocentricity of his belief, will justify it, on the basis of those things which he, as a culture-bearer, has been taught to value.

SPECULATIVE COMMENTS: An Assumption Concerning the Future of Man

This chapter on the major ground-of-meaning assumptions of American culture, will close with the reminder that Americans assume in the face of all dour predictions and warnings, first of all, that there will be a future for man as we know him, and secondly, that it is in the future that man's progress will be evident. This is somewhat different from the outlook of other societies in the past. Often cultures have assumed "We know everything now, and there is no more room for progress." Today, the American seems to consider the present as only a transitory position between the past and the future. He knows that we do not know everything...now. But someday in the future we may.

This last comment is made simply to caution the reader that the American we are talking about now may not be the same twenty years hence. American culture, including its values, assumptions, institutions, and deviations must be expected to change and adapt to new conditions and increasing cross-cultural contact.[9]

---

9. See Ralph Linton's excellent description of cultural diffusion; pp. 325-327, The Study of Man, N.Y.: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1936.

II.A THE FAMILY

by Thomas Van Valey

The family in American society is perhaps one of the most avidly studied of the institutions. The reason for this is clear: the family is the starting place for America's future citizens. Here they receive many of their initial (and long-lasting) attitudes, values, prejudices, and ambitions...in short, their socialization. It is also from the family that they embark on their own course to form families and continue the process.

There are a number of identifiable characteristics of American families. Some of these are also common to other cultures while some are not. We will deal in this paper with only those aspects of the American family that serve to describe it as institution.

John Sirjamaki provides the following list of items characteristic of the American family:

> "...monogamous marriage; conjugal family with limited kin reckoning; considerable divorce and remarriage; family reduced in size and functions; increased individuation of family members with approaching husband-wife equality and particular emphasis on children; marriage as a sacrament, but with considerable secularism."[1]

This is, of course, a highly generalized outline. However, it is safe to say that it is, in general, an accurate description of the American family.

---

[1] Sirjamaki, 1947, pp. 255-256.

One notable characteristic which Sirjamaki does not mention is the fact that Americans tend to view the family of orientation "...as a marker to show the starting place and measure (their) ability not only in terms of where they are but also how far they have moved."[2]

This implies that the family itself does not pass on its status or prestige directly to succeeding generations.* Rather, each individual must determine his own status by virtue of his achievements, not those of his predecessors. "Insofar as individuals improve their class status by virtue of their own achievements rather than by birth, the family's ability to pass along status to children has been limited."[3]

Another related topic is the notion that marriage is for life, and that breaks (divorce, separation, etc.) are failures, reflecting on the marriage partners.[4] (This should be discussed within the context of the belief that marriages are based on the mutual choice and love of the couple, rather than upon an arrangement by parents, other relatives, or friends.) Within this perspective, dissolving or ending a marriage is often seen as a personal reflection on the character of the couple involved. In the extreme case, the stigma attached to a broken marriage may resemble the following: "They couldn't make their marriage work. Something is wrong with them."

---

[2] Walter Goldschmidt. "Social Class and the Dynamics of Status in America," American Anthropoligist, vol. 57, 1955, p. 1214.

* This is most accurate in the middle class. There are exceptions with regard to both the aristocratic upper class and the extreme lower class. These families do pass on their status, or lack of it, to succeeding members. However, even in these cases, the inheritance received is primarily the opportunity for the attainment of status rather than the status itself. The incoming generations of these two groups receive, or fail to receive, the training, social graces, material wealth, intellectual stimulation, and so on, which enable them to attain a relatively equal or greater degree of social status and/or prestige.

[3] Boyd and Worchester, 1964, p. 364.

On the other hand, there is some evidence that this attitude is changing. Some authors have stated that Americans are increasingly viewing marriage as terminable.[5] Through this perspective, a marriage may be dissolved if either or both of the partners feel that it is necessary and would be to their mutual advantage. Moreover, it implies that the aforementioned stigma would no longer be attached to such actions.

Another characteristic of the American family is the informality of the relations among its members. Americans tend toward more casual, easygoing, and friendly relations, in contrast to the more formal and authoritarian relations which seem to characterize the traditional European family. (This also applies largely to the society as an entirety. Most of the visitors to the United States remark about the informality, uncommon friendliness, likeability, and hospitality of the American people. This style of interpersonal relationships seems to permeate the entire range of behavior.)

---

[4] Margaret Mead. "The Contemporary American Family as an Anthropologist Sees It," American Journal of Sociology, vol. 53, May 1948, pp. 453-459.

[5] Ibid. This does not alter in any way the still predominant American value of monogamous marriage--one husband and one wife... at a time.

One current trend in the American family (which may be followed chronologically by a similar trend in French society) is the increasing emphasis on interpersonal enjoyment as the primary basis for family interaction. As a consequence, it may be argued that the family has not been robbed of its former functions such as the disciplining of children. Rather, as additional social institutions have arisen, the members of the family have gladly left to other agencies the disagreeable functions that clashed with the rising value of companionship. (The increase in divorce is probably partly traceable to this newly dominant value.)

The causes behind the emergence of this value appear to be diverse. Besides the multiplication of institutions, already mentioned as creating a permissive situation, the likely causes include the "fun morality" described by Martha Wolfenstein; equalitarianism, in the sense of respect for all persons; the accent on youth; and the notion that satisfaction is much the same in nature for all members of the family.

A final feature of the American familial institution is the alleged superficiality of the relationships.* This is especially true of the dating and courtship systems which are peculiar to American culture. Le Masters has said, "Our (American) whole courtship experience, up to the point of engagement, tends to produce essentially

---

* It may be that this is also characteristic of the total society. If so, one can conceive of linkages between it and the informality noted parenthetically above.

superficial or segmental relationships with our dating partners."[6] The observation (and criticism) here is that the dating system, as practiced today, does not provide the majority of individuals with the opportunity to know potential marital partners as total personalities.

Basic to this alleged superficiality of family relationships is the type of training many children receive in the home, through the family, at school, in church or Sunday school, and from their friends. The American child is taught that he or she should get along with others, and that this is more important than learning a skill or trade. Perhaps it is for this reason that Farber makes the following statement:

> "The American pattern aims at a smoothly functioning individual, equipped for getting ahead with a varied armament of social skills."[7]

One topic meriting discussion in this chapter is the orientation of the American family to the future. This has been discussed, in a general way, in both of the preceding chapters. Here it will be stated in terms of the family rather than the culture, and a possible counter-trend will be noted.

It follows from the limited ability of the family to pass on status directly, and the resultant necessity for individuals to achieve their own status, that the American people are not

---

6. E.E. Le Masters, Modern Courtship and Marriage, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1959, p. 159.
7. M.L. Farber. "English and Americans: Values in the Socialization Process." Journal of Psychology, Oct., 1953, p. 246.

concerned with their families of the past (i.e. their families of orientation). Similarly, it follows that there will be little concern about the extended kinship relations characteristic of historic times and lesser-developed countries because these individuals will be able to provide little or no "profit" to the individual outside of superficial and limited psychological security. Consequently, "The American middle-class family much prefers the future for all sorts of choices and decisions. They expect change and prefer anything new to anything old."[8] The modern family is not concerned with tradition, the past, its ancestors, or, for that matter, most of the relatives. Instead, it is concerned with the future and what it may bring.

The possible "counter-trend" to this familial orientation toward the future is fairly recent in origin. Moreover, in contrast to the historical debate between the orientation being "forward" to the future, or "backward" to the past, this new counter-trend is primarily oriented to the present, with minor futuristic tendencies.

Here we are speaking of the family's emphasis on the gratification of personality needs rather than societal ends, with a resulting general orientation of capriciousness and frivolity in family institutional practices.[9] This seems to be

---

8. J.P. Spiegel, "Conflicting formal and informal roles in newly acculturated families," Research Publications Association for Reserach in Nervous and Mental Disease, vol. 42, 1964, p. 309.
9. R.D. Lambert and M. Bressler, "Indian students and the United States: Cross-cultural images," The Annals, vol. 295, pp. 62-72. See also, Charles Morris, 1956, pp. 33-84; Clyde and Florence Kluckhohn, 1947. (See also the discussion by R. Leik on pp. 38-39 of this chapter.)

the hedonistic tendency often postulated by psychological and psychiatric theorists as central to human behavior (e.g. Freud's id). The central question is the effect of this trend, if it is real and continues to develop over time.

II.B THE RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS

by Thomas Van Valey

This chapter will deal with some of the major characteristics of the American religious institution, and will raise questions which may lead to additional insights into the nature of the institution. We leave for later studies a systematic effort to relate the religious institution to the value system and to the other social institutions.

During the early part of this century when immigration was at its peak, the United States was popularly referred to as a "melting pot." This is true of the period 1945-1965, especially with regard to religion, in the sense that the culture shows a tremendous amount of religious diversity. Robin Williams has reported a large number of separate religions, denominations, sects, cults, and other organized groupings, estimated at about 255 in all.[1]

Such an extent of religious multiplicity is important in itself, as it contrasts markedly with the situation in most modern European nations. However, even more significant than this high degree of diversity is the low degree of both personal and institutional stress associated with it. It can even be said that there is widespread religious tolerance, both official and individual.

Official tolerance in America takes the form of inter-denominational and inter-religious conferences, meetings, and discussions, all of which implement the intra-group and inter-group communication of values, strategies, policies, and doctrines. In the recent past, a consolidation of our society's religious elements has been evidenced by the merging of a number of denominations into larger more

---

1. Robin Williams, American Society, 2nd ed., 1961, p. 342.

inclusive organizations. Such mergers could also be argued as indications of a trend toward decreasing religious diversity. However, as these typically affect only a few separate denominations which have already been closely related, it would be more plausible to suggest that they would not have any significant effect on the total degree of diversity.

On the individual and personal level, tolerance assumes another form. The American people generally believe that religion should be an important factor in everyone's life. They do not care which religion an individual follows, as long as he follows one of the major ones.[2] There is considerable suspicion regarding some religious sects or cults.

From this general American attitude, as outlined above, a newcomer in the United States would expect a relaxed, tolerant attitude toward divergent religious beliefs. This, however, is only the ideal of the "American way of tolerance." Observers and students of religion have pointed out that there is a considerable amount of "infighting" within and among religious groups. An instance of such religious intolerance is the general practice of many Americans not to discuss religion with strangers at a social gathering... for fear of causing a heated argument, and an embarrassing situation.

It has also been documented that the religion to which one belongs has some effects on other aspects of his behavior. People not only attend churches, they tend to apply the attitudes of the church to all aspects of their lives; they associate with members of their own belief group, they support the church's political favorite--they come to depend on the church to develop their

---

2. Boyd and Worchester, 1964, p. 365.

attitudes for them.[3] Consequently, when there is such a high degree of intercorrelation among various aspects of behavior, it is probable that some disparities and ensuing conflicts will occur. It may even be that these coincidental disparities and conflicts are the principal causes of whatever religious intolerance exists, rather than official policy being the cause.[4]

John Sirjamaki, in his brief outline of the major elements of the religious institution, noted a distinct emphasis upon individualism in American religion.[5] The most common explanation of this fact maintains that individualism is an outgrowth of early Puritanistic and Calvinistic doctrines which recognize "...the dignity of the individual and... his duty to achieve both spiritual and material prosperity."[6] It is also argued, however, that American religion was, in the past, more individually oriented than it is at present. That is, institutionalized religion today has value primarily in response to a need for group affiliation and stability, rather than in terms of intensified personal religious life.[7] Thus there may be a general cultural trend, in which religion is becoming more of a social than an individual experience.

---

[3] Gerhard Lenski, The Religious Factor. See also, Robin Williams, American Society; and Leonard Broom and Philip Selznick, Sociology, Row, Peterson, and Co., 1958.

[4] There is evidence that the degree of intolerance and "in-fighting" is relaxing, at least with regard to candidates for national office. (eg., the election of a Catholic President in 1960.) The increasing spread of higher education might also be expected to accelerate the diffusion of more tolerant attitudes toward religion.

[5] John Sirjamaki, 1947, pp. 255-256.

[6] Boyd and Worchester, 1964, p. 365. Commager, 1950, p. 411.

One final characteristic deserving mention is the distinctly moral function which religion performs. Americans believe that some moral justification is necessary for their actions, especially economic. Otherwise, such actions are not "proper" or "right." This is especially true in cases where a particular mode of behavior or plan of action is controversial. In such instances a religious body tends to lend its legitimized sanction, but only where some moral purpose (as defined by that religious organization) is a clearly evident factor in the desired mode of behavior.

---

7. Clyde Kluckhohn, "The Evolution of Contemporary American Values," *Deadalus*, Spring, 1958, pp. 78-109. See also W.H. Seurel, P.T. Morris, and S.M. Davidsen, "Scandinavian Students Images of the United States," *The Annals*, vol. 295, pp. 126-135, and Michelle Simon, "Questionnaire on French Project"(Background Data for the Teaching of French) files. These last two references should be taken as possibly biased since both are reports of extra-culturals' impressions of what they have observed during their stay in the United States as students.

II.C THE ECONOMIC INSTITUTIONS

By J.Benjamin Gillingham

Robin Williams, in American Society, offers us a wide-ranging yet concise and useful summary statement of the salient features of the American economic system.

> 1. It is an economy of mass production, operating under a factory system utilizing a highly developed technology.
> 2. Industrial production is characterized by a minute specialization and division of labor.
> 3. Industrial processes, tasks, and products are highly standardized.
> 4. That portentous social invention, the corporation, is the dominant form of organization of business enterprise.
> 5. Corporate ownership is widely diffused; production and control are highly concentrated. Ownership and management of corporations have become separated, with far-reaching consequences.
> 6. There are very important systems of intercorporate coordination and control.
> 7. Large-scale units and administrative coordination lead to quasi-monopoly,"imperfect competition," and price rigidities.
> 8. Large-scale industrial labor unions play an increasingly weighty role.
> 9. Because of specialization of production, a highly developed monetary and credit system, and other factors, the various segments of the economy are closely interdependent, and changes in any one major portion of the system have immediate and complex repercussions elsewhere.
> 10. Central governments, both federal and state, intervene in economic activity on a wide scale through direct regulation and facilitation and through the indirect consequences of their other operations.
> 11. "Property rights" are in a state of rapid change, and the facts are radically

different from those envisaged in popular ideologies and in certain important legal fictions.

12. The entire economy is subject to incessant development and innovation, through factors ranging from the impact of revolutionary inventions to the influence of international politics and war.

13. Governmental expenditures constitute an important sector of the economy.

14. There is widespread and increasing development of "social security," e.g., over fifty million workers are potentially eligible for unemployment compensation, over ninety millions have claims to federal old-age insurance.[5]

Any condensed summary, such as this one by Professor Williams, inevitably involves rather heroic simplifications of the diversities and complexities of a phenomenon as large and manifold as the American economy. The hazard of oversimplification should be kept in mind. The following comments are offered by way of qualification or expansion of some of Professor Williams's statements.

II.C.1 Structure

While it is true that large-scale corporations and concentrated economic power characterize the economic structure, it is also true that the U.S. economy is characterized by a very large number of small, independently and privately owned economic enterprises. In fact, about 95 per cent of all private business enterprises employ fewer than 20 employees. For the year 1964, among the 3,350,000 firms reporting under the Social Security Act (this excludes farm workers, self-employed persons, public employees, and railroad employees who are covered by a separate system), 90 per cent employed fewer than twenty employees and 78 per cent employed fewer than eight employees, while only six-tenths of one per cent employed more than 250 employees. However, it is estimated that one per cent of all firms (the largest firms) employ approximately one-half of all the non-agricultural employees in private

---

[5] Williams, 1960, pp. 163-164. To item 14 should be added "Medicare", the sweeping provisions of hospital and medical care for persons over 65 under a nationwide federally administered program.

√

employment. Hence we observe in the U.S. case an economy characterized by both a small number of very large enterprises and a very large number of small and moderate-sized enterprises. Moreover, contrary to oft-heard expressions, there is no evidence that small enterprise is rapidly being swallowed up by "big business". To the contrary, except in agriculture, the number of small firms and self-employed persons continues to grow as the economy and the population grow.

The industrial composition and the changes in this composition over the past two decades are indicated in the following simple table:

Number of Farm Workers, and of Non-agricultural Wage and Salary** Workers - (in thousands)

	1930	1947	1966
Total	41,921	54,263	69,122
Farm Employment*	12,497	10,382	5,259
Non-Farm Employment	29,424	43,881	63,863
Manufacturing	9,562	15,545	19,084
Mining	1,009	955	628
Contract Construction	1,372	1,982	3,281
Transp.and Pub.Utilities	3,685	4,166	4,136
Wholesale and Retail Trade	5,797	8,955	13,219
Finance, Ins.,and Real Estate	1,457	1,754	3,085
Service and Misc.	3,376	5,050	9,581
Government - Federal	526	1,892	2,566
Government - State and Local	2,622	3,582	8,283

* Includes family workers as well as hired workers.
** Source: Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics

The most noteworthy aspects revealed by these figures are: (a) the large *absolute* decline in agricultural employment despite rapid growth in total population, total labor force and total farm production; (b) the relatively rapid growth of the Services and Government, particularly State and Local Government since 1947; and (c) the overall shift from the commodity and goods producing sectors to the trade, services, transportation and government sectors, so that since 1955 or thereabouts, more than half the total labor force is employed in the so-called tertiary industries, i.e., those not producing commodities or physical goods.

Coinciding with the above trends have been related changes in the occupational composition of the U.S. labor force. The following table shows those changes along with the recent projections for the next decade:

OCCUPATIONAL COMPOSITION OF THE U.S. LABOR FORCE, 1910, 1940, 1962, and Projection for 1975 (from Lloyd Reynolds. Labor Economics and Labor Relations. Prentice-Hall 4th ed., 1964, p. 335.)**

Occupational Group	1910	1940	1962	projected 1975
Total employed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	4.6	7.9	11.8	14.2
Farmers and farm mgrs.	17.3	11.4	3.9	*
Managers, officials, and proprietors except farm	7.2	8.1	10.9	10.7
Clerical and kindred workers	5.5	9.7	14.9	16.2
Sales workers	5.0	6.8	6.4	6.7
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	11.7	11.5	12.8	12.8
Operatives and kindred workers	14.1	18.9	17.8	16.3
Service workers	9.6	11.8	12.9	14.3
Farm laborers and foremen	13.4	6.9	3.4	*
Laborers, except farm and mine	11.6	7.0	5.3	4.5

* Farmers, farm managers, and farm laborers are combined in the 1975 projections. It is estimated that they will together form 4.5 per cent of the labor force at that time.

**Quoted by permission of Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

II.C.2 The Competitive Market Ideal

While it is true that the concentration of economic power in the very large corporate enterprises may and often does impair in some degree the operation of the competitive market forces on which the rationale for a free, private enterprise system rests, two relevant facts should be kept in mind. The first is that the U.S. has been almost unique among the advanced industrial nations in pursuing an explicit public policy which defines monopoly as illegal and provides both criminal and civil penalties for a broad range of activities having the effect of restraining trade and reducing competition. The open cartel arrangements for dividing markets and regulating prices which are commonplace in the economies of many industrial nations are illegal in the United States. Secondly, the "horizontal" expansion of many large firms over a variety of diversified industries and their readiness to invade any promising markets, along with the rapid pace of technological innovation and the development of new products, have resulted in an intensified competition among large firms in the area of product improvement, new product development, etc., so that it has become more difficult for even a very large corporation to establish and exploit for any considerable period of time a significant monopoly position. Hence, in an important degree, in the large scale sectors of the economy, the decay of the classical perfect market type of price competition has been replaced in some degree by competition in product changes and new products and services.

II.C.3 The Role of Government

With rising incomes and general education levels, there has been a rapid upward shift in the demand by American citizens for increased quality and quantity of public services, particularly in the areas of education, transportation and general social welfare. As a result, government, particularly state and local government, has grown rapidly as a producer of goods and services, and also as an agency through which the production of such goods is contracted out to private enterprises. In 1966, Federal Government purchases of goods and services were approximately $77 billion* and the state and local government purchases were about the same. This is roughly one-fifth of the total Gross National Product of the U.S. economy in that period. Although a very substantial portion of the Federal expenditures currently are for national defense, the long-term trend would appear to be toward rising expenditures in the total public sector even though with good fortune we may be able to scale down substantially our military expenditures in the near future. In brief, the various governmental agencies are exceedingly large and important producers as well as "purchasing agents" for the private sector in behalf of various public activities.

---

* This figure does not include transfer payments, e.g.,Social Security payments, grants to state and local governments,or interest on the public debt.

The other crucial economic role of government, especially Federal government, is as the regulator of the economy. It is now generally accepted in the United States that our agreed-upon goals and purposes for the economy, e.g., full employment, reasonable price stability, an appropriate rate of economic growth, a progressive and efficient economy, relative freedom in private economic choices -- can be achieved only by a sophisticated and continuous adjustment of certain governmental functions, particularly those relating to monetary policy and broad fiscal policy, i.e., the total amount and type of taxes collected and the amount and types of public expenditures. It should be kept in mind that the basic strategy of such controls is to establish an environment in which the private households and business firms will be encouraged to take those actions which will move us toward the desired ends, i.e., full employment, avoiding serious inflation, etc. In brief, these are indirect controls by design and philosophy.

There are of course a myriad of more direct controls, e.g., pure food and drug laws, industrial pollution controls, etc., which are inevitable in an ever more complex and interrelated social system.

II.C.4 Income Distribution

One salient fact of the U.S. economy is that by a very large margin it is the most productive economy in the aggregate and on a per capita basis in the contemporary world and in the history of the world. And there is sound reason to expect that this margin will remain substantial for the remainder of this century. A second salient fact is somewhat paradoxical. The preponderant mass of the American people, say about 75 per cent, share reasonably well in the distribution of our huge output. But the top 5 per cent enjoy a huge disproportionate share, primarily as a result of the pattern of ownership of property and corporate assets. About two-thirds of total dividend payments and about half of all property income go to this top 5 per cent of income receivers (who also receive about 10 per cent of the total wage and salary income). And on the other hand, the bottom 15 or 20 per cent of our families receive incomes which are by consensus defined as too low to meet the minimum requirements of American standards. The poverty level is currently defined as that for a family with an income of less than $3,000 per year in 1965 prices. Over the past twenty years, the percentage of all families which fall into this poverty category has declined from 30 per cent to about 16.5 per cent, but this still means some 8 million families who are sharing little or not at all in our remarkable affluence. One of the major new programs of social policy launched in this decade for the first time in our history is the so-called War on Poverty which is directed through a broad spectrum of specific programs toward achieving a more equitable sharing of our output by these left-out citizens. The main attack being developed is two-fold: the first is a many-sided program to assist and encourage the able-bodied members of this population to acquire the education, training and competence which will enable them to be more productive members of the labor force and hence able to help themselves; the second is to devise new policies and programs for transferring income to those members of the poverty class who are clearly incapable of providing for themselves -- the aged, the very young, the disabled, the defective, in short, the proverbial lame, halt, and blind, who constitute more than one-half of the total poverty population.

II.C.5 Trade Unions and Industrial Relations

The trade union movement in the U.S. is and has been historically characterized by an absence of class consciousness. The American worker has not accepted or subscribed to the notion that he could improve his individual position only by somehow improving the status and power of the entire wage-earning class as such. Rather, he has been job-conscious and has manifested a propensity for organization based on the more limited basis of common job interest arising from common skills or employment by a particular company or in a particular industry.

His interests have been focussed primarily on developing job control through negotiating collective bargaining agreements with his employer incorporating the terms and conditions of employment, including work rules governing such matters as hours of work, seniority rights, exercise of disciplinary powers by the employer, and methods of adjudicating grievances.

Through this process of development of a private, joint system of industrial self-government by employers and unions, the American labor movement developed into an essentially conservative institution in long-run terms, seeking to improve the status, security and dignity of employees vis-a-vis the employer, but seeking these improvements within the basic institutional arrangement of a private enterprise system based on the private ownership of the means of production, with government leaving to the private parties wide latitude for self-determination in devising the rules of the work place. American unionism is explicitly anti-socialist in its major political orientation. And it has rejected the concept of an independent labor political party.

The consensus among the best informed political economists is that the gross economic effects often imputed to unions and collective bargaining -- e.g., wage-push inflation, distortion of wage structures, economic inefficiencies, changes in income distribution -- are much smaller in magnitude than generally assumed, and that the most significant effect has been the development of the system of collective bargaining as a distinctive institution and process for governing the complex and fundamentally important relationships between employers and employees in a free society. The right of workers to organize freely into unions of their own choice is protected as a matter of law, and employers are required by law to recognize and bargain in good faith with bona fide unions representing their employees. Approximately one-third of all non-agricultural employees are members of unions, most of these being in manufacturing, construction, transportation, and the skilled crafts. Very recently there has been an upsurge of collective bargaining among some professional workers, particularly teachers and nurses, and among public employees, but in general white-collar workers have largely refrained from becoming union members. Total union membership has remained relatively stable over the past decade and currently constitutes a somewhat smaller percentage of total non-agricultural employment than in 1945.

II.D THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SYSTEM

by Alex Gottfried

The political system of the United States is a complex, dynamic phenomenon. Of course this can be said about any political system but it is particularly true of the United States for at least the following reasons: 1) its population:- large, diverse, dynamic, multi-ethnic, multi-racial, peripatetic, rapidly "younging" and rapidly aging; 2) its long constitutional history: it has the oldest written constitution presently in force; 3) its complicated structure: ideas, laws, programs and policies must first run the gauntlet to discover whether they are constitutional, before it can be asked whether they be wise, just, prudent or feasible; 4) its chaotic system of tens of thousands of governmental units; 5) its decentralized, undisciplined, locally based party system; 6) its unique institution of judicial review which permits the courts to nullify acts of all the political (elected) branches and units of government; 7) its equally unique, powerful (and growing more powerful) pervasive presidency; 8) its vastly productive economic system with rapid concentration of control into fewer and fewer hands and its speedy movement towards collaboration with powerful military officials pointing to the development of what President Eisenhower described as the industrial-military complex; 9) its electorate or "public opinion": a citizenry which is simultaneously literate, articulate, mercurial and irresponsible, moving (many critics say) in the direction of mass society to "escape from freedom."

This complexity makes impossible any brief, treatment of American political society and/or institutions which would not be overly generalized to the point of inaccuracy and probably banality. To do justice to the nine characteristics listed above would require a long manuscript. It would be a disservice to prospective teachers of French to offer them "instant" definitions, descriptions or analyses of "limited government," checks and balances," "federalism," "democracy," "republic," "constitutionalism," "separation of powers," "judicial supremacy," "judicial review," etc. Rule-of-thumb definitions may be found, if wanted, in such publications as Joseph Dunner, ed., Dictionary of Political Science, Philosophical Library, New York, 1964; J. Plano and M. Greenberg, The American Political Dictionary, N.Y., H olt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962, ff., (a new edition is expected in 1967). Julius Gould and William L. Kolb, eds., The Dictionary of the Social Sciences, The Free Press, 1964; and to that monumental many-volume repository, the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (a new enlarged edition is scheduled to appear in 1967 as the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences).

To avoid the great danger of over-simplification which is inevitable in the summary treatment of the topic under discussion, I prefer to make a select bibliography. The judicious use of it will permit language teachers to read sophisticated, complete treatments of subtle phenomena. In this realm of discourse, more than in many others, "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing" since too many of us are already prisoners of a great deal of conventional cliche, cant and myth. Other things being equal, brief works rather than larger ones are recommended and paperbacks if possible. Especially valuable items will be preceded by asterisks.

II. D. 1. General

For an over-view of the entire political system, many excellent college textbooks are available. Here are a few of the most widely used:

Burns, James M. and Jack W. Peltason. _Government by the People._ Prentice-Hall, 1965 (available in paperback). -- Perhaps the most popular of all American government college texts. The writing is vivid and quite un-textbookish. Elaborate illustrations, cartoons, art-work, etc.

*Carr, R.K., M.H. Bernstein and W.F. Murphy. _American Democracy in Theory and Practice_, 4th ed., N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963 (available in paperback). -- This is especially useful in its chapters on the Constitution and its comprehensive treatment of civil liberties.

Ebenstein, William, C. Herman Pritchett, Henry H. Turner and Dean Mann. _American Democracy in World Perspective._ Harper and Row, 1967 (available in paperback). -- A new text.

*Spiro, Herbert J. _Government by Constitution: The Political Systems of Democracy._ Random House, 1959 (available in paperback). -- An imaginative and relatively brief comparative treatment of eight western political systems. United States institutions are interestingly juxtaposed against such systems as those of Sweden, France, England, West Germany, etc. Its summary chapter (11) on the United States is especially useful--a _tour de force_ in only 17 pages. Consideration is given to many central factors in addition to those usually identified as institutions. These include major issues, policies and problems, political styles, representation, cleavage and consensus, etc.

II. D. 2. Democracy

*Dahl, Robert A. *A Preface to Democratic Theory.* University of Chicago Press, 1956 (available in paperback). -- Very highly regarded by political scientists. Though brief, it offers a rigorous and a logical presentation of several democratic perspectives and develops models for each of them.

________. *Who Governs ? Democracy in an American City.* Yale University Press, 1961 (available in paperback). -- A much acclaimed sophisticated study of urban problems based upon vast quantities of empiric data. It attempts to answer the question posed in the title. Its answer is significantly different from that given by Mills and Hunter (below).

Hunter, Floyd. *Community Power Structure.* Doubleday, 1953 (available in paperback). -- An important pioneering work in urban power studies. Hunter reports different locii of power in Atlanta than Dahl found in New Haven.

*Mariel, Henry S. *The Promise of Politics.* Prentice-Hall, 1966 (available in paperback). -- Trenchant, incisive, provocative treatment of contemporary political life. It is written with verve and imagination.

Lippman, Walter. *The Public Philosophy.* Mentor, 1955 (available in paperback). -- Incisive analysis of the major political institutions by the dean of American pundet-journalists. He makes a plea for government by an elite which has masterer "the public philosophy." Brief!

*Mayo, Henry B. *An Introduction to Democratic Theory.* Oxford, 1960 (available in paperback).-- An excellent general study of democratic practices, values and accomplishments.

*Mills, C. Wright, *Power Elite*. Oxford, 1956 (available in paperback). -- One of the seminal books of recent years. Many elites are described. The author holds that it is "the power elite," not "the people," who govern.

Presthus, R. *Men At the Top: A Study in Community Power*. Oxford, 1963 (available in paperback). -- Combines the approaches of Dahl, Mills and Hunter in a most interesting comparative study.

Tyssman, Joseph. *Obligation and the Body Politic*. Oxford, 1962 (available in paperback). -- An original, brief and thoughtful analysis of democratic citizenship and its responsibilities.

II. D. 3. The Constitution

*Goldwin, Robert A., ed. *A Nation of States*. Rand McNally, 1961 (available in paperback).-- A useful collection of essays about federalism leaning somewhat towards the "conservative" (states-right) side. The essay by Grodzins is the most valuable; his concept of "marble-cake government" is insightful.

Holcombe, Arthur N. *Our More Perfect Union*. Harvard University Press, 1950. -- A comprehensive account and defense of the great contributions of the authors of the Constitution.

*Pritchett, C. Herman. *The American Constitutional System*. McGraw-Hill, 1962 (available in paperback). -- Very concise, clear, lucid.

Rossiter, Clinton L. *Seedtime of the Republic*. Harcourt, Brace & World, 1953. -- A trenchant analysis of the political thinking and the intellectual ferment which provided the context for the Constitution.

Westin, Alan F. *Anatomy of a Constitutional Law Case*. Norton, 1958 (available in paperback). -- Intriguing complete story of President Truman's seizure of the steel mills during the Korean War.

II. D. 4. Politics, Parties, Interest Groups, Public Opinion

Binkley, Wilfred E. *American Political Parties*. Knopf, 1943. -- Useful historical background for contemporary politics.

Bullitt, Stimson. *To Be A Politician*. Doubleday (paperback edition), 1959. -- Highly praised, brief account of campaigning from the point of view of a defeated candidate.

Burdick, Eugene and Arthur J. Brodbeck, *American Voting Behavior*. Free Press, 1959. -- Useful collection of essays dealing with empiric research in voting.

*Burns, James M. *The Deadlock of Democracy*. Prentice-Hall, 1963 (available in paperback).-- An intriguing study, both historical and analytic. He finds that the American party system contains four, not two major parties.

*Greenstein, Fred L. *The American Party System and the American People*. Prentice-Hall, 1963 (available in paperback). -- One of the best short treatments.

Key, V.O., Jr. *Public Opinion and American Democracy*. Knopf, 1961. -- The definitive, comprehensive work in this field.

*————. *Southern Politics in State and Nation.* Knopf, 1949 (available in paperback). -- Encyclopedic study of sectional politics. It has frequently been described as "brilliant."

*Lane Robert E. and David O. Sears. *Public Opinion.* Prentice-Hall, 1964 (available in paperback). -- Short, but clear presentation of a difficult subject.

Moss, Malcolm. *The Republicans.* Random House, 1956 (available in paperback). -- The best history of the GOP by a political scientist who was an important Eisenhower staff-member.

O'Connor, Edwin. *The Last Hurrah.* Little Brown, 1956. -- Novel describing Boston politics and a thinly-disguised Boss Curley. Also available in paperback.

Rossiter, Clinton L. *Parties and Politics in America.* Cornell University Press, 1960 (available in paperback). -- Written with grace and style. Emphasizes historical materials.

*Schattschneider, E.E. *The Struggle for Party Government.* University of Maryland Press, 1948. --Brief but challenging plea for stronger, more disciplined parties.

*Truman, David. *The Governmental Process.* Knopf, 1951. -- One of the most highly regarded works by an American political scientist. Thorough, comprehensive, theoretical analyses of the group basis of American politics.

Warren, Robert Penn. *All the King's Men.* Grosset and Dunlap, 1946. -- Also available in paperback. The best novel about American state politics. The state is Louisana and its central figure, Willie Stark bears a striking resemblance to Huey Long.

*Zeigler, Harmon. *Interest Groups in American Society*. Prentice-Hall, 1964 (available in paperback). -- The best short treatment of a subject which is often mistreated.

II.D.5. Congress

*Bailey, Stephen K. *The New Congress*. St. Martins, 1966 (available in paperback). -- New, concise, useful.

———. *Congress Makes a Law*. Columbia University Press, 1950 (available in paperback).-- An interesting account of the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946.

Berman, Daniel J. *A Bill Becomes a Law*. Macmillan, 1962. -- A similar treatment of the Civil Rights Act of 1960.

*Gross, Bertram. *The Legislative Struggle: A Study in Social Combat*, McGraw-Hill, 1953.-- One of the most skillful and imaginative portrayals of Congress.

Lowi, Theodore J. *Legislative Politics USA*. Little, Brown, 1965 (available in paperback) -- A thoughtfully selected group of articles.

II.D.6. The Presidency and the Executive

Koenig, Louis W. *Congress and the President*. Scott Foresman. -- A concise study by one of the leading students of the presidency.

Neustadt, Richard E. *Presidential Power: The Politics of Leadership*. Wiley, 1960. -- A celebrated and path-finding work. Its focus is on the problems of being president and sights insttutional and descriptive materials. Also available in paperback.

*Rossiter, Clinton. The American Presidency. Mentor, 1960 (available in paperback). -- The best brief, general treatment--balanced, comprehensive and extremely well-written.

*Woll, Peter. American Bureaucracy. Norton, 1963 (available in paperback). -- Useful, brief description of the problems of public administration.

II. D. 7. The Judiciary

*Abraham, Henry J. The Judicial Process. Oxford, 1962 (available in paperback). -- A well-balanced, clear, useful short treatment.

Beth, Loren P. Politics, The Constitution and the Supreme Court. Harper, Row, 1962. -- A sound treatment of the politics of judicial review.

Black, Charles L., Jr. The People and the Courts. Macmillan, 1960 (available in paperback). -- A well-written, clear defense of judicial review, especially the contribution of the courts in the defense of civil liberties.

Murphy, Walter. Wiretapping, A Case Study in the Judicial Process. Random House, 1965, (available in paperback). -- A well-written concise, description of the way in which complex problems are resolved by the judiciary.

II. D. 8. Civil Liberties

Baldwin, James. Go Tell It On the Mountain. Knopf, 1952, Signet (paperback edition), 1963. -- Three of the best novels by American Negroes about American Negro life.

Becker, Carl. Freedom and Responsibility in the American Way of Life. Knopf, 1945. -- An eloquent statement of the compatibility between freedom and order in a political system.

Brown, Ralph Jr. Loyalty and Security. Yale University Press, 1958 (available in paperback). --Complete and thorough-going treatment of the loyalty-security problem.

Ellison, Ralph. Invisible Man. Random House, 1947; Signet (paperback edition) 1960.

Griffin, John Howard. Black Like Me. Signet, (paperback edition) 1960. -- A white, Texas writer adopts dark pigmentation and discovers what it means to be a Negro in the United States.

Grimes, Alan P. Equality in America. Oxford, 1964 (available in paperback). -- An able short account of those problems of contemporary problems of equality: race, religion and the urban majority.

*Meiklejohn, Alexander. Political Freedom. Harper, 1960 (available in paperback). -- One of the most able defenses of the value of freedom of speech to society.

Redding, Saunders. On Being Negro in America. Bobbs-Merrill, 1951; Bantam (paperback edition) 1964. -- A moving, eloquent personal statement by a sensitive, insightful intellectual.

*Rose, Arnold. The Negro in America. Harper, 1948. -- A masterful condensation of Myrdahl's classic analysis.

Silberman, Charles E. *Crisis in Black and White.* Vintage, 1965 (available in paperback). -- Imaginative and readable account which pulls no punches and avoids preaching sentimentality.

*Way, Frank H. *Liberty in the Balance.* McGraw-Hill, 1964 (available in paperback). -- An admirable, brief effort to summarize the major contemporary civil liberties problems.

Wright, Richard. *Native Son.* Harper, 1940; Signet (paperback edition) 1961.

II.C. 9. Selected Content Issues

Bell, Daniel, ed. *The Radical Right.* Doubleday, 1964 (available in paperback). -- A useful anthology, although somewhat uneven. Weston's article is among the most interesting.

Fromm, Erich. *Escape From Freedom.* Rinehart, 1964.

________. *Man for Himself.* Rinehart, 1947. -- All three are provocative pieces of social criticism based upon psychological insights.

________. *The Sane Society.* Rinehart, 1955.

Galbraith, Kenneth J. *The Affluent Society.* Houghton Mifflin, 1958 (available in paperback).

Harrington, Michael. *The Other America.* Penguin, 1964 (available in paperback). -- The celebrated, brilliant book which officially rediscovered poverty.

*Kennan, George F. American Diplomacy, 1900-1950. University of Chicago Press, 1951 (available in paperback).

II.D Politics

Lerche, Charles O. *America in World Affairs.* McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Myrdahl, Gunnar. *Beyond the Welfare State.* Yale University, Yale University Press, 1961 (available in paperback).

Redford, Emmett S. *American Government and the Economy.* Macmillan, 1965 (available in paperback)

II. E. AMERICAN EDUCATION

"... free, tax-supported, compulsory, nonsectarian schools; mass education; a single-track rather than a dual school system in which all pupils receive similar training; local administration of schools; a large variety of public and private schools with varied curricula, attempting to meet the problems of a complex civilization.[1]

This paper is concerned with formal education, or schooling, rather than with education in an informal or diffuse sense. Since socialization, acculturation, beliefs, values, and the diffusion of the culture have already been related to cultural and societal features, they will not be discussed here. Education will mean the school systems from elementary school to graduate school, public and private.

Americans attribute a great deal of significance to education, in all realms of behavior. Socially, the amount of education that an individual obtains determines in part his social prestige or the occupational position that he will later hold. This is because education is commonly viewed as the most efficient "mobility escalator" in operation. In short, education is socially significant because it provides a means to the culturally approved ends of success, achievement, prestige, mobility, and the like.

Since the eighteenth century, Americans have recognized the political significance of education. Widespread education is generally assumed to be politically important on the ground that a democratic system "requires an educated citizenry so that individuals may participate in the decisions of public policy..."[2] and also because it brings strength and security to the national society.

---

[1] Sirjamaki, 1947, p. 256.

In the last few decades, it has come to be felt that education has a new importance in connection with social, technological, and vocational change. The American government, and American industry are pouring billions of dollars into education and related research and development as a good investment for later years. This development is so new that its results cannot be foreseen.

As a result of so perceiving the value of education, it is natural that Americans have developed great faith in education both for the individual and for society. This faith in education, however, is not universal throughout American society. Substantial numbers of persons feel that education should be only a means to an end: that it should be practically-oriented, so as to equip an individual for a vocation rather than attempting to train "the whole man" for his place in the world. It is from this view that much of the anti-intellectualism derives. There is research evidence that social class influences educational attitudes. The lower classes tend to be vocationally oriented with regard to education, while the upper classes are more intellectually oriented. Performance in school, moreover, rises with the socioeconomic level except at the top level, where the performance varies inversely.

---

[2] Williams, 1960, p. 291.

II.E Education

Education in America is mass education in that everyone, within prescribed age limits, is supposed to receive at least a certain common, basic training. At the same time, a great deal of the increasing educational research during the past decade has concentrated upon individual differences and the needs of exceptional children and of the underprivileged. During the 1960's, a major development has been the effort to intensify the human development of children whose surrounding subculture inhibits their fulfillment, as judged by the common values of the culture (I.A.). This movement has been assisted by Title I of its Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Related to the universalizing of school experience is the belief that the educational institutions are the basic medium by which "Americanization" is carried out.[3] This belief has usually referred to the great numbers of immigrants of diverse origins with which America was flooded in past decades. However, it still applies to some extent for every child entering school, for the school now fulfills a socializing function which was once the function of the family. Through this socialization the American school system "Americanizes" its children; it seeks to support common patterns of behavior.

Two aspects of American education may be deduced from a number of studies of foreign students in America[4]--studies designed to ascertain the values and attitudes of various types of foreign students toward a number of American behaviors, values and social institutions. With respect to education, they often replied that they were struck with the informality, freedom, and sociability of American students and of the American system in general. They were often critical of these features, judging that they were carried too far and limited the quality of American education. Another characteristic often noted is the amount of competition in American schools--among classes, clubs, and individuals; for grades, memberships, money; and especially in sports. This stress on competition, the foreign students felt, was also detrimental to the quality of education: a drain on the personal resources needed for academic endeavors.

---

[3] Commager, 1947.

[4] See F.D. Scott, "The Swedish Students Image of the United States," *The Annals*, 295, pp. 136-145; W.R.B. Klinger, "Moral Values Across Cultures," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, Oct. 1962; and J.P. Spiegel, 1964 (op. cit.)

Robin Williams provides an excellent list of characteristics of American educational institutions which complement and expand Sirjamaki's outline cited earlier in this chapter.[5] These characteristics are summarized below.

1. A generally uniform education is available to all social and economic classes; but uniformity rests on agreement within the educational institution, not on national standardization.

2. Control of the educational system has in the past been totally vested in municipal officials, either elected or hired locally, and in school boards that are elected locally. Currently local and state governments control the system, with some beginnings of national control discernible.

---

4. (continuation) See also entire volume 295, The Annals.

[5] Robin Williams, 1960, pp. 294-295.

3. In general, school systems are bureaucratic, and becoming increasingly so.

4. Students pass through a continuous series of stages from nursery school or kindergarten to the university, the stages usually unbroken by special selective examinations at any step until entrance into the university, graduate and professional schools. This is in marked contrast to European systems generally.

5. Elementary education is seldom differentiated in terms of whether pupils will be continuing at the secondary and higher levels or not.

6. There is an omnipresent "grading" system, which typically assigns quantitative scores for standardized competitive achievement.

7. Teacher-student relations are highly conventionalized but are on the whole more "informal" and equalitarian than in European systems.

One should add that standards and requirements differ widely from one region or even from one school district to another, despite efforts of private agencies and of the government to obtain a nationwide "leveling up" to satisfactory minima.

Higher education shows a similarly wide range of variation in quality. Insofar as the unevenness arises from differing student capacity, it is of course the inevitable consequence of the intent to enable each person to reach his unique potential. For the present, the unevenness is being accentuated by the effort to accommodate increasing numbers of students in two year or four year colleges. Since shortly after mid-century, more than half of the secondary school graduates have gone on to some form of further schooling.

It remains a largely unsolved problem, to combine the intensive pursuit of excellence successfully with the spreading of educational opportunity throughout the period of adolencence. Yet even at present, the differentiation of institutions, and of programs within universities, in achieving an unprecedented development of a certain "second level of talent," highly important for society as well as for the individual. (In earlier societies this large group has proved to be not only less effectual than it could have been, but more or less disaffected and antagonistic.) At the same time, the numerous minority of the gifted are benefiting by an increasingly effective criticism and improvement of the whole educational system.

II.F THE INTELLECTUAL-ESTHETIC INSTITUTIONS

by Thomas L. Van Valey

In this short section we are dealing with the intellectual and esthetic activities in America. We are doing so because they are closely linked with some of the major social institutions, and because their exploration should provide additional insight into American culture.

Intellectual and esthetic activities cannot be defined as an institution. They are not values at the center of a set of interrelated norms which are usually associated with a relatively formalized organization. Rather, they are a series of separate, but related activities which are widely followed and valued highly. Our purpose is simply to examine the features of intellectual and esthetic systems currently in operation in American society, and to raise any questions, which may prove beneficial in the analysis of those systems.

For analytical purposes, we are including the following as components of the American intellectual-esthetic systems:

the Arts (including painting, sculpture, music and drama.)
Literature (both imaginative and discursive.)
Films
Architecture (also urban design, interior decorating, and other related areas.)

According to both popular belief and the limited evidence, there seems to be a separation within the American population regarding the patronization of the arts and the other components of the American intellectual-esthetic systems.

The composition of the groups resulting in this separation is in question at present, but there are several possible answers, any or all of which may be partially or wholly correct. One basis of such a separation is the different attitudes of the sexes. Women follow the arts, while men follow their chosen occupations and little else. This is only a partial explanation of the question of course. There probably are a great number of women who don't patronize the intellectual and esthetic systems; yet, there are also large numbers of men who do attend them.

A second notion is that the separation is class oriented, with the upper classes being greatly involved and the lower classes being, to a great extent, excluded. This is, in part, a result of the greater educational and financial opportunities of the upper classes. Since great efforts are being made by the government, businesses, and private citizens alike, similar opportunities are opening up for even the lowest and least privileged of the socio-economic classes. Current lower class values however, particularly for the men, are strongly opposed to the intellectual and the esthetic.

A view similar to the previous one is that of a disjunction between the "intellectual elite" and the rest of the population. The members of the intelligentsia not only patronize the arts, they also exercise a great deal of control over their production and acceptance, Thus, the general public either follows the trends as dictated by a small minority of the population, or ignores the intellectual- esthetic sphere altogether.

It may well be that all of these ideas do apply. In this respect, the upper classes intermingle with, and are more attentive to the intellectual elite; and it is here that the women enjoy free reign in the "cultural" sphere, as they are not bound to their traditional duties in the house. On the other hand, the lower classes, constituting the "masses" or the public, do not have such great opportunities for involvement in the intellectual-esthetic systems. In this case, the women have more of the traditionally functional duties to perform for themselves and thus are neither motivated nor able to patronize the arts to such an extent.

Earlier it was stated that efforts are being made by various groups to enlarge the opportunities for involvement in the intellectual and esthetic systems. This brings up the question of the support of the arts and whether there is a conflict between institutionalized and popular forms of support.

In America, the arts are, for the most part, supported by the general public. Ever increasing attendance at community symphonies, repertory theaters, and opera are evidence of this fact. However, it may be that such public support is becoming less essential due to increasing financial support from institutionalized sources--foundations, and agencies of the state and federal government.[1] The final result of this increased support from foundations and governmental agencies is not certain. It may lead to the usurpation of the supporting of intellectual-esthetic systems by institutionalized organizations. However, it is more likely that a plurality of support will develop. Here, the general public, business foundations, and the government will all contribute time, energy, and financial backing to the expansion and maintenance of the arts and the other components of the intellectual-esthetic systems.

---

[1] This is reminiscent of the typical European system in which the arts are almost wholly supported by the government and/or wealthy, aristocratic individuals or families. At present, though, the arts in America are definitely supported primarily by the public.

II. G. THE AMERICAN RECREATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

by Thomas L. Van Valey

> "...an emerging institution; recreation under private non-profit, public, and commercial auspices; both participant and spectator sports, many of them attached to high schools and colleges; many commercial enterprises, being guided by profit, which border on the unmoral or antisocial; the automobile, radio, movies, and similar inventions having had a profound transforming influence on American life."[1]

As Sirjamaki states above, the recreational "institution" is an emerging one. This simply means that the set of institutional norms has not yet developed around a sufficiently distinct complex of values [2] to make recreation in the United States completely institutionalized. As a matter of fact, a great deal of recreation is highly individualized personal behavior, outside the context of our definition of an institution. Consequently , we will not discuss it in as great detail as some of the more developed social institutions.

Observers recognize the American fondness for recreational activity. This fondness is a major factor in explaining the exploitation,

---

1. Sirjamaki, 1947, pp. 255-256.
2. Williams, 1960, p. 31.

through an amazing variety of recreational activities, of the natural resources available to the average American: beaches fronting two oceans and a gulf; many climates; major ranges of mountains; hundreds of thousands of acres of both state and national parks and recreational areas; a multi-million dollar tourist trade, predominantly American though including significant numbers of foreign visitors; a multi-billion dollar sporting industry (including equipment and facilities--spectator and participant) for the major sports such as baseball, ice hockey, football, softball, basketball, golf, and tennis; a world-renowned motion picture industry; television and radio; the list is almost without end.

Recreation is a big business in America. Quite apart from the economic aspect, it is important to Americans intrinsically. Leisure time is highly valued in this work-oriented country, but not as an end in itself. It is seen as valuable only when it is good for something: it must be used, not wasted. This may explain the observation by foreign visitors that in America there is no distinction between work and recreation. Americans seem to work as hard at enjoying themselves as they do at making a living.

Related to the notion of putting leisure time to good use is the American intolerance of a person's feeling bored, especially when the person is "off the job."[3] In fact, "being bored," to an American, often carries moral overtones: "It's not right," "I want to (or should) do something."

---

3. G. Gorer, The American People (New York: W. W. Norton and Cp., 1948.)

Finally, organized recreation is neither wholly family-centered nor group-centered, but is often organized in accord with each individual's desires and the preferences of his close friends and associates. It is in this context that individuals or families decide in what activity they will participate at any given time.[4]

---

[4]. Reference groups, of course, limit the individual's range of recreational choices, and social pressure may also influence the individual's or the group's choice within the range of acceptable activities.

II.H . THE AMERICAN MEDIA SYSTEM

by Alex Edelstein

In the American market economy, the best product is defined as the one that survives in the marketplace. The American media system, reflective of its economic environment and itself a product of economic man, defines itself in the same way. Just as the ideology of the free marketplace preaches a doctrine of laissez-faire and of Adam Smith economics, so the doctrine of absolute freedom of the press preaches unrestrained competition of media units and of media content, seeking to define media and message quality in terms of quantitative measures of media audiences and attention. Thus the American media system has come to be called a "mass communications" system and we have become increasingly concerned with the incidence of a "mass culture."

The term "mass communications" does not fully explain the American media system, however, just as Adam Smith economics and laissez-faire explain only in part the governing philosophy of the American enterprise system. Adam Smith economics has given way in significant part to Keynesian economics, and "absolute freedom" of communications--if it ever existed--quite early gave way to a doctrine of "social responsibility" based upon a broad acceptance of the fact that there is no absolute freedom of the press or of the individual. The press is either restrained or restrains itself in certain public and private sectors, and federal and local governments and the individual are similarly constrained. Rather than absolute freedom, a broader and more fully accepted tradition prevails--a system of checks and balances of private and public interests.

By European standards, however, the American media system is a relatively unregulated one. In contrast to European practice, there may be an infinite number of broadcasting networks and stations, limited only by the availability of clear broadcasting frequencies. (This, however, is due more to the productivity of the American market and its handmaiden, the advertising industry, than it is to democratic ideology.) Similarly, most European nations have only one national and international newsgathering network, e.g., Agence France Press in France, or Reuters in Britain, while the United States has its Associated Press, United Press International, and various other special newspaper services, each competing with the others.

Although the American and European broadcasting and press systems all have systems of control, the structures are markedly different. Almost all European governments either control or operate their state broadcasting networks and newsgathering services. (While a second, commercial broadcasting system is becoming common in Europe, a second worldwide newsgathering agency is a rarity.) The broadcasting systems are controlled by government-appointed or parlimentary boards, and ethical standards in press and broadcasting usually are codified and reviewed by a council or commission.

In the United States the "control" of the broadcasting and press systems is economic or social and is essentially self-regulatory rather than governmental, legislative, or council-or commission-regulated. The single exception is the nominal control over broadcasting vested in the Federal Communications Commission (FCC); but this control has been exercised infrequently and in limited fashion. The real control in American broadcasting lies in industry-developed and financed "code boards." The Television Code

Board, as an example, sets standards for the industry for "voluntary compliance"; most broadcasting units accept the Code Board standards and contribute to the support of the Board. The same principle controls the advertising industry, the press, motion pictures, comic books, magazines, and other media. A curious exception is the "underground press," which presently is devoted to attacks on societal standards and mores and which runs the range from the "way-out" political left and right to the "far-out" syndromes of sexual, narcotic, "tribal" and other deviants. These publications illuminate the extent to which social control is exercised over the "mass" media and dramatize the fact that it is difficult to maintain media units on a mass circulation basis where they do not express widespread social values. Indeed, to the extent that the "underground" or far-out press seeks to broaden its appeal, it becomes a mass medium. Such media either find a common denominator and grow into mass vehicles or they become more and more narrowly based. Few American publications have been able to survive by maintaining an original core of readers; generational attrition and the lure of new audiences invariable have brought changes in editorial content.

There appear presently to be two trends in American media: (1) fragmentation and/or heterogeniety, and (2) concentration and homogeniety. The pluralism of American society, facilitated by economic productivity and individual drives for personal development, has permitted enormous personal mobility. Laboring and white collar classes as well as administrative and executive talent are moving so rapidly up the mobility ladder that they do not have time to shed their old class characteristics before they take up their new styles of life.

The response to such development has been, on the one hand, an expanded mass media with a concentration of ownership and homogeniety of content, and as the counterpart, a special or pluralistic media, responding to the development of individual skills and tastes. While the pressure for more efficient advertising and distribution of goods to a mass market has reduced the number of competitive newspaper units, the rise of "pluralistic man" has stimulated a concurrent growth in technical and special publications designed to advance him in his profession and to introduce him to leisure ways. The Wall Street Journal, as an example, has responded to business activity and introduced middle-class readers to business life. The Country Gentleman similarly introduced farmers to a more comfortable middle-class life.

The magazine industry has been particularly responsive. On the one hand, the mass circulation publications are experiencing difficulty in maintaining mass audiences, for readers have not been able to find in the pages of the general-interest, mass-circulation publications the special assistance they require to attain career symbols and outlooks. The largest circulation magazines are, in McLuhan's terms, only "rear-view windows" of the lives the readers have led. They are not designs for future living. As a result, a vast number of special or pluralistic publications have been created to prepare the "new men" for their new roles.

The London Economist, commenting on the nature of change in America during the past 20 years, asserts that technological and individual development have created a "national character" that America will reflect for the rest of the century. "Americans have become an urban, middle-class people whose universities turn out huge numbers of bouncy young intellectuals and whose industry depends upon a stunningly sophisticated technology," says The Economist. It declares that the continuing public debates over the "credibility gap" in American politics actually reflect the discrepancy between the kinds of people most Americans used to be and the kinds of people most Americans are now. The urban intellectuals have developed minimum requirements for information, for judging information, and for making judgments based upon such information.

The mass media either cannot or do not know how to satisfy such tastes. This is reflected in the pattern of mutual criticism which has developed, in which the new intellectual and his new, pluralistic media decry mass media and vice versa. The mutual dissatisfaction contributes to a compulsion on all sides to engage in criticism rather than to objectively evaluate the standards which invoke the criticism.

Interestingly, the presumed beneficiary of efforts to upgrade the mass media--the mass public--has been merely an observer of the contest. The CBS-sponsored analysis of public acceptance of television (Gary Steiner, The People Look at Television) shows a general favorability toward television content even on the part of the professionals. This is undoubtedly a structural factor at work. The mobile American media audiences live in two cultures; the culture in which they have been living and the culture for which they are preparing. Even if the individual is not himself mobile, his class is, and he must keep pace with it if he is not to become alienated or anomic, i.e., if he is not to lose touch with the values of his group.

Because the new man is in movement, he

cannot take all of his ideas or his culture with him. He must depend upon the media to help him to formulate new ideas or at the least, to tell him what they are. He depends upon the media for information and advice. The media must be accurate and timely. Above all, he asks that the media be efficient. As economic men, both the media managers and the media audiences operate on principles of least effort: the maximum information must be processed and assimilated in minimum time. This principle applies to diversion, or entertainment, as well. For example, television is the most accessible and definitive in content and thus requires the least effort. Radio requires imagery, and the printed word requires attention and antecedent knowledge. Radio and the print media obviously require more effort. Hence there is less attention to them where effort *is* required.

The principle of least effort has a variety of implications for the mass media and for mass culture, but only a few of these conditions can be considered here. One is that while the pluralistic media can be expected to concern themselves with cultural continuity and change, the mass media can be concerned only with the *illusion* of change. Where the pluralistic media are specific about the nature of change, the mass media either are narrowly specific or broadly vague. The mass media, and perhaps properly so, take care not to over-inform their audiences or demand that the audiences *act* upon the information they have received. The mass media may occasionally tell their audiences where they have been, and take pains to tell them where they are *now*, but only the pluralistic media can deal effectively with the entire sequence of human events. Unfortunately, there is a limited audience for this fuller context, for few persons live exclusively or even predominantly in a pluralistic culture. Like immigrants, most of us live part of the time in the old culture and part of the time in the new. We watch television, listen to the radio, read the local newspaper, *Time*, *Life*, *Playboy*, and the *New Yorker*; we explore *Atlantic*, *The New Republic*, *Daedalus* or the *Evergreen Review*; or we neurotically feast upon *Ramparts*, the National Review, or the *Psychedelic Review*. *As a principle, where we are involved in communications tasks requiring great effort, we are attentive also to media requiring the least effort.* But the obverse is not true; engaging *in the least effort does not assure greater effort!* This is not just a mass media principle; it is an observalble fact of human activity.

Ernest Van Den Haag, a dedicated critic of mass culture, fixes his gaze upon the conditions of a mass media and a mass culture, but he does not speak of any second, pluralistic culture, for which, for many, the mass culture is a base. But with this single standard, he indicts *both* cultures.

We nevertheless agree in these things: That in the United States, and in Europe as well, the characteristics of a mass culture are concomitants of any industrial, mass production society--this includes France, as well. Among these characteristics are increased individual income, mobility and leisure, more education, and more communication. In the United States, and it might properly hold for other industrial societies, the larger the city the more media there are, and the more informed and attuned the mass audiences are to the media.

But we also disagree: As we have said, Van Den Haag's mass culture is unidimensional. He would include in it only those who live in a *single* culture, *popular* culture. He excludes from participation in mass or popular culture those who enjoy individualization in work and differentiation in taste. We assert that many "cultural immigrants" still live *in part* in a popular or mass culture. Van Den Haag asserts a Marxian construct of alienation relating to mass culture which "separates the producers of culture from the consumers" and speaks of the child "who listens to a pocket radio and who no longer sings." Is there *no* feedback from consumers? May not the girl *sing*, as well? Possibly she has learned more tunes than the girl who is not transistorized. He speaks of audiences confined to Walt Disney on television and isolated form the Brothers Grimm in books. Are the two conditions necessary? He implies that mass is directly equivalent to average and that (ritualistic) Mass is superior to "intellectual curiosity." This strikes one as an act itself of religious faith. Kitsch, he says, has expelled aesthetics, and morality and the primary groups have shrunk in relevance and in size. Mass culture becomes a means of escape rather than of diversion. How does Van Den Haag define "escape?" However, as an underlying principle, we seem to agree that any second culture will be maximized, not through *mass* media, but by specialized or pluralistic media. Van Den Haag would tax the mass media out of existence, but in our view, enterprise ideology will provide the means to compete with it. While the mass media still are viable, given a loss in audience or influence they will be susceptible both to taxation and competition.

American concern has charateristically been with two cultures--the mass media and the pluralistic media. The Huchins Commission of the 1950s made recommendations for a *pluralistic* press rather than for a *mass* press; the Carnegie Corporation wishes to endow and levy a tax in behalf of a *pluralistic* television network for members of the second culture. A single mass culture is an inadequate description of the impact of the mass media in an industrial society. Pluralistic culture is more inclusive and certainly more realistic.

Now, what kinds of questions and answers relating to the condition of the mass media and the pluralistic media are suggested to us by a theory of two cultures?

As questions, the theory asks *what is* "freedom of the press" rather than asserting *there is* freedom of the press. It *answers* that press freedom is defined in many ways; it permits fair comment but not malice about even the most public of public figures. It permits qualified privilege but not unqualified access to news of government. It permits no prior restraint upon the press, but it holds the press responsible for what it has published. It attempts to assure the accused of a trial which is free of prejudicial publicity but it guarantees there will be no conspiratorial silence. While "freedom of the press" is given protections under the Bill of Rights to the Constitution, the courts assert that this carries with it a *responsibility to inform* and the press has itself coined the expression that the public has a "right to know." While freedoms and restraints are conspicuously vague, the laws which spell out freedom are being constantly interpreted. This, too, is a kind of freedom.

It would be simple to state that the American press is a press of the middle. It is not. It is a press which incorporates both sides: Democrats and Republicans, liberals and Republicans. It is a *vertical* press. Our theory of two cultures suggests that there is room for consensus *and* room for deviation within the vertical, non-competitive press.

Is there "managed news" by the party in power? Yes, but there have also been managed parties by newspapers in power? There are checks and balances. The Moss subcommittee of the House of Representatives has held marathon meetings on freedom of access to government news and has staged full-scale investigations into managed news. During time of war, there is more management and less freedom. To be sure, that is a source of danger. We must end war.

Are there pressure groups affecting press performance? Pressures grow out of identification with mass or class, not pressure of class upon mass. Within the newspaper structure some conflict between mass and class exists: publishers are conservative while reporters are more liberal, for publishers tend to be members of one culture while the reporter speaks for both mass and class. But the conflict is inevitable and is part of the system of checks and balances, and this is the essence of our two cultures.

The American Media System: Bibliography

1950. Riesman, David (with Nathan Glazer and Reuel Denny). *The Lonely Crowd.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1950.

1957. Hoggart, Richard. *The Uses of Literacy.* Chatto & Windus, 1957.

Rosenberg, Bernard, and David Manning White (eds.). *Mass Culture.* London: Free Press of Glencoe, 1957.

Seldes, Gilbert V. *The 7 Lively Arts.* New York: Sagamore Press, 1957.

1958. Larrabee, Eric (ed.). *Mass Leisure.* Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1958.

1959. Griffith, Thomas. *The Waist-High Culture.* New York: Harper, 1959.

Wright, Charles. *Mass Communication; a sociological perspective.* New York: Random House, 1959.

1960. Williams, Raymond, *The Long Revolution.* Chatto & Windmus, 1960.

1961. Jacobs, Eric (ed.). *Culture for the Millions.* Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1961.

1962. Boorstin, Daniel J. *The Image or What Happened to the American Dream.* New York: Atheneum, 1962.

Josephson, Eric (ed.). *Man Alone; alienation in modern society.* New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1962.

1963. MacDonald, Dwight. *Against the American Grain.* Gollancz, 1963.

1964. McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

1965. Hall, Stuart and Paddy Whannel. *The Popular Arts.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1965.

1966. Edelstein, Alex S. *Perspectives in Mass Communications.* Copenhagen: Einar Harcks Forlag, 1966

II. J. SOCIAL STRATIFICATION

by Thomas L. Van Valey

The stratification in American society relates closely to the economic institutions: numerous areas of concern within the two fields overlap and affect one another. The common indicators of status or class position are also basic elements of the system of economic organization.

Our discussion will begin with a theoretical orientation which should clarify the interrelationships implied by the subject matter. This will be followed by an outline of some characteristics of the American system, and a brief bibliography.

America is a heterogeneous nation--occupationally, geographically, religiously, linguistically, and so on. What we shall explore is the way in which the stratification system relates to that heterogeneity.

In general, wherever there has been a high degree of cultural and societal heterogeneity, there has also been, associated with it, a complex system of stratification. A prime example is the United States, but we could also include the Roman Empire under Augustus, or any other culture encompassing a relatively large national territory and a multiplicity of racial-ethnic and occupational groups.

Theoretically, the reasons for this association lie in the fact that there must be some form of social organization wherever there is a collection of people—a population. When a population grows, the system of organization must elaborate to deal with the increments. One way in which organizations have elaborated is through their social stratification systems.

At first (and this is true of many primitive or under-developed areas of the world today), the stratification system may be based simply on family or clan membership, the older members receiving the highest status and the greatest privileges. As a population grows and its composition becomes more varied, this simple system can no longer be applied. There are too many groups and individuals who simply don't "fit." Thus the system expands to take into account occupation, religious affiliation, political position, or racial-ethnic background. The system of stratification keeps pace with the increasing degree of cultural heterogeneity, which, in turn, is a function of the size of the population.

The United States is usually described as having an "open class" system of social stratification.

> Here there are no legal recognitions of group inequality, and there are minimum differences between the total ways of life of the classes. Furthermore, there is much movement from one class to another, both in the lifetime of a man and from one generation to another.[1]

---

1. Joseph Kahl. The American Class Structure. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, 1964, p. 14.

From the above statement alone, the newcomer to America might expect to find a quite homogenous population in which there is little inequality among groups, and a great deal of vertical mobilty (either upward or downward).

The first of these expectations differs from reality. In America, there is a significant amount of social inequality, especially with regard to religious and racial-ethnic minorities. This inequality is linked with prejudice, and discrimination is often directed toward individuals recognized as members of such minorities. This is true of the Negro in the Southeast, the Mexican in the Southwest, and the Oriental in the West. In America today, discrimination against the Negro is most prevalent.

> An Associated Press dispatch which appeared in the New York Times for December 1, 1966, stated that "A Census Bureau study of the Negro at mid-decade found that: Of the 4.4 million Negro families, about half lived in the South. One of every four Negro adults had completed four years of high school or some college but in the South the proportion was one out of six. It was one of three in the North and West. Negro families are larger in the South than in the North and West--4.56 persons compared with 4.11 persons. Negro families in the South have lower incomes and more children to support than Negroes in the North and West...The percentage of Negroes in the total population has changed little since the turn of the century and the greatest change has been in

location--away from the South and farms into the metropolitan areas."[2]

The second of the expectations, mobility, tends to hold true. There is a great deal of movement from one class to another in America, though such movement is primarily inter-generational, while intra-generational movement is ordinarily within the limits of a single class.[3] Besides the social mobility, there is great geographical mobility in the United States. Every year, nearly twenty percent of the nation's population changes its place of residence.

The causes of the social mobility are not completely clear; but, from the available research evidence it seems that inter-generational mobility is due in part to a difference in degree of education and thereby the occupations of members of succeeding generations, with consequent differences in occupation. On the other hand, since few individuals make extreme changes in their own educational and occupational positions, their movement is usually within the limits of a single social class.[4]

There are less obvious characteristics of the American stratification system. One is that no set of criteria for ranking is accepted throughout the country. Each group, class, or status tends to have its own perspective

---

2. Edgar Dale, The News Letter. (School of Education, Ohio State University), Vol. 32, January 4, 1967, p. 1.
3. Intra-generational movement tends to be within the limits of a single class particularly in the more recent period, i.e., since World War I.
4. Particularly noteworthy, however, is the great effort and commitment of resources made to effectuate an explicit policy of affording equal educational opportunity for all to higher and higher levels. For example, at the present time approximately 40 per cent of all high

and standards of ranking. This results in differently located classes having, and emphasizing, different criteria for ranking.[5]

Social class has a great number of correlates, which can be divided into two groups: those which are chiefly indicators of status and those which are chiefly consequences of it. Among the indicators are education, occupation, income, religion, and ethnic or racial classification. Among the consequences of status and of its attendant conditions are health, individual attitudes and general life style.

There are a number of methodological problems involved in the determination of social class, for all of the common indicators are highly related to one another. To resolve the difficulties it is often necessary to use complicated statistical techniques.

The sources listed below are primarily community studies that have been carried out in various regions of the United States. While each study is limited to one area, together they provide a wealth of descriptive information on stratification in American communities.

---

4. school students (and high school is compulsory in most states) go on to some type of formal education beyond high school, the bulk of this being in regular academic colleges and universities.
5. On status inconsistency, see Gerhard Lenski, "Status Crystallization: A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status," American Sociological Review,19(1954), 405-413; and Elton Jackson, (Status Consistency and Symptoms of Stress," American Sociological Review, 27 (1962), 469-480.

II.J Stratification

1. Robert S. and Helen W. Lynd, Middletown: A Study in Contemporary American Culture (New York, 1929).
2. W. Lloyd Warner and Associates, Democracy in Jonesville (New York, 1949).
3. August Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth (New York, 1949).
4. John Dollard, Caste and Class in a Southern Town (2nd ed. New York, 1949).
5. James West, Plainville, U.S.A. (New York, 1945).
6. Alfred W. Jones, Life, Liberty, and Property (Philadelphia, 1941).
7. for other sources see Robin Williams, American Society, p. 112.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
FOR CONTEMPORARY U.S. CULTURE AND SOCIETY

Sources Referred To

Note: See also the brief specialized bibliographies at the end of the chapters on "Economic Institutions," "Political Institutions," and "Mass Communications."

Berelson, Bernard, and Gary A. Steiner. Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964. [Most of the cultural and societal findings pertain to the U.S. See the critical review by Jules Henry, Scientific American, 211, July, 1964, pp. 129-130.]

Boyd, M., and D. Worchester. American Civilization. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1964. [A general treatment of American society, its institutions, and some of the trends presently developing. Little research-related evidence in support of the statements.]

Brodersen, A. "Themes in the Interpretation of America by Prominent Visitors from Abroad: America Through Foreign Eyes." The Annals, 295, Sept. 1954. [Discusses Tocqueville, Bryce, and Weber, then examines a study by the author of views of America by foreign visitors.]

Coleman, Lee. "What Is American? A Study of Alleged American Traits." Social Forces, 1941, pp. 492-499. [An analysis of numerous reported American traits. The statements referring to the country as a whole attempt a summary from the literature.]

Commager, H.S. America in Perspective. New York: Random House, 1947. [An anthology of articles on various aspects of American society and culture. Most were written before World War II but help to provide a base-line for historical comparison.]

______. *The American Mind*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1950. A sequel to *America in Perspective*. [The information is more up to date, and can be supported by other sources. (This is not done by the author.) As in the other work, the material seems to follow a primarily historical perspective.]

Davis, K., H. Bredemeir, and M. Levy. *Modern American Society*. New York: Rinehart, 1949. [A book of readings on American society. The last chapter (26) is a sort of summary or concluding chapter by the editors. Primarily sociological in approach.]

DuBois, Cora. "The Dominant Value Profile of American Culture." *American Anthropologist*, 57, 1955, pp. 1232-1239. [Analysis of the major values of American society with some statement of assumptions. Limited by the author to middle-class Americans.]

Graham, Saxon. *American Culture: An Analysis of Its Development and Present Characteristics*. New York: Harper and Bros. 1957.

Klinger, M.R.B., and J. Veroff. "Cross-cultural Dimensions in Expressed Moral Values." *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, May, 1964, pp. 899-903. [A report of a research project carried out by the authors. An attempt to find universal moral structures through the analysis of expressed moral statements.]

Kluckhohn, Clyde, and Florence R. "American Culture: Generalized Orientations and Class Patterns." *Conflicts of Power in Modern Culture*, New York: Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion in Their Relation to Their Democratic Way of Life, Symposium No. 7, 1947. [Statements about some proposed major orientations in American society. (Not research supported--more theoretical.) Primarily anthropological in approach and language.]

References

Kluckhohn, Clyde. "An Anthropologist Looks at the U.S." *Mirror for Man*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1944, New York: Faucet Publications Inc., 1963, pp.228-261. [One chapter of an anthropological classic. Basically the same as "American Culture: Generalized Orientations..." in topics. However, in this chapter, the topics are covered in more depth.]

Martindale, D. *American Social Structure*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1960. [A text in American institutions and social organization. The usual coverage in a sociologically oriented text. Differing point of view and approach from other major works.]

* Morris, C.. *Varieties of Human Value.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956. [Statement and explanation of several proposed value orientations of American college students. Determined by the factor analysis of the "Ways of Life" questionnaire. Interesting conclusions, in contrast to other sources.]

Rostow, W.W. "The American National Style." *Daedalus*, Spring 1958, pp. 110-114. [An attempt to summarize the major elements of the American "National Character." Basically anthropological in approach. Some attention paid to recent and projected changes.]

Simone, M. "Questionnaire on French Attitudes About Americans." unpublished research. University of Washington, 1965. [Summary of the information gained from a questionnaire administered to French culture-bearers about American society. Mostly statements about alleged American characteristics.]

Sirjamaki, J. "A Footnote to the Anthropological Approach to the Study of American Culture." *Social Forces*, 25, 1947, pp. 253-263. [An excellent analysis of the major American institutions by an anthropologist--sociologist. An important summary reference in the study of American society.]

* Marty, Jean, et Alfred Fontenilles. *American Society Today. A Critical Approach*. Paris: Hachette, 1969. Collection *Hachette Université*. [An informed French appraisal.]

References

Spitzer, H.M. "Presenting America in American Propaganda." Public Opinion Quarterly, 11, Summer, 1947, pp. 213-221. [An analysis of what America should project in a portrait of American society. Highly generalized topics concerning values, characteristics, and orientations.]

Williams, R.M. American Society. New York: Knopf, 1960. [One of the classic texts on American society. Very complete and well documented. An excellent reference in the study of American culture containing much verifiable information.]

Supplementary Sources

Aberle, D.F. "Shared Values in Complex Societies." American Sociological Review, 15, No. 4, 1950, pp. 495-502. [Theoretical statements that there are common values in a complex society but that analysis is required to identify them. (None is reported in this article.)]

Adams, J.T. Our Business Civilization. NY: A&C Born, 1929.

Adler, Franz. "The Value Concept in Sociology." American Journal of Sociology, No. 62, 1956, pp. 272-279. [A theoretical discussion of the concept of value--little empirical relation to American culture.]

Albert, E.M., and C. Kluckhohn. [A selected bibliography on values, ethics, and esthetics in the behavioral sciences and philosophy, 1920-1958]

Allport, Gordon W., and Philip E. Vernon. A Study of Values. New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1952. [A study of general values with reference to personality. Not related to either cultural or societal values.]

Arensberg, Conrad M. "American Communities." American Anthropologist, 57, 1955, pp. 1143-1162. [Discussion of the distinguishable types of communities and the ways these community-types reflect American culture (or sub-cultures). A summary and illustration of the community-study method in Anthropology.]

Armed Forces Information and Education. Facts About the United States. Armed Forces Information and Education. Washington, 1965. [A short, strictly factual outline of the U.S.A. Little or no material on the value system or general social structure.]

Supplementary

Bales, R.F. and A.S. Couch. *The Value Profile: A Factor Analytic Study of Value Statements.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., mimeographed paper. [Report of a study by the authors concerning the valued basis (as determined by factor analysis) of value statements. Excellent example of a research oriented study in Sociology.]

Barghoorn, F.C. "The Soviet Image of the United States: A Deliberately Distorted Image." *The Annals*, 295, Sept. 1954, pp. 42-51. [A discussion of the "party-line" about America, both past and present.]

Barnes, H.E., and O. Rudei. *The American Way of Life.* New York: Prentice-Hall, 1949. [A textbook on social problems, with emphasis on the means to change or modernize the U.S. and eliminate culture lag (the postulated cause of all social problems).]

Barrett, Donald N., ed. *Values in America.* Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961. [A collection of articles concerning American values, mostly of the theoretical type.]

Beals, R.L. "The Mexican Student Views the United States." The Annals, 295, Sept. 1954, pp. 108-115. [A study of what Mexican students think about America. Provides a non-American perspective on the content of American culture.]

Beck, S.J., et. al. "The Normal Personality as Projected in the Rorschach Test." *Journal of Psychology*, Oct. 1950, pp. 241-298. [Discussion of a research project involving Rorschach tests of normal adults. There are no generalizations to societal or national "character."]

Bettelheim, B. "Growing Up Female." *Harper's*, Oct. 1962, 225, pp. 120-128.

Brogan, D. *The American Character.* NY: Time, Inc., 1962. [General statements about American characteristics and attitudes. Little empirical support, but it coincides with other, more research-oriented studies.]

———. *American Themes*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1949. [Selections of the author's writings on America. It concerns the usual notions about American culture. The worth of the book lies mainly in its translation of abstract concepts into laymen's terms.]

———. *U.S.A.* NY: Oxford University Press, 1941.

Buchanan, W. "How Others See Us." *The Annals*. 295, Sept. 1954, pp. 1-11. [From a reported UNESCO opinion poll, a discussion of stereotypes about Americans held by non-culture bearers.]

Caudill, W. "Japanese-American Personality and Acculturation," *Genetic Psychology Monogram*, Feb., 1952, pp. 5-10. [Discussion of the personality characteristics of newly acculturated Japanese Americans. Provides some interesting insights into class-related aspects of American life.]

Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. *Report of the President, 1959-1960, Fund for the Republic*, Inc. New York, 1960. [Summary of the Center's activities during its first two years of existence. A report of publications and programs with reference to the various American institutions.]

Chester, E.W. "Europe Views America: A Critical Evolution." *External Research*. Fall, 1962.

Commager, H.S. *Living Ideas in America*, NY: Harper, 1951. [An anthology of readings about the U.S.A., generally, a historical perspective. The readings are excerpts from larger articles and books. A commentary rather than a scholarly analysis.]

Committee on Friendly Relations Among Foreign Students, *Living in the United States*. [The fourth chapter, "American Community Life," deals with American communities. There is some explanation of "things to look for and expect" in living in the United States.]

Supplementary

Common Council for American Unity. *European Beliefs Regarding the U.S.*, NY, 1949. [A study shortly after WWII, revealing many attitudes of Europeans toward the U.S. (Most were propaganda-type questions or the usual ideas about the U.S.)]

Cuber, John, Robert Harper, and William Kenkel. *Problems of American Society: Values in Conflict*, NY: H. Holt, 1956.

Daedalus. Edition on the American National Style, 87, Spring, 1958, [A good summary edition about the American National Style from an Anthropological-Historical viewpoint.]

Davis, Jerome. *Capitalism and Its Culture*, NY: Farrar and Rinehart, 1941.

Denney, Renel. "How Americans See Themselves: Studies of American National Character." *The Annals*, 295, 1954, pp. 11-25. [A report of studies about American character from an anthropological viewpoint. It contains observations of the American character, taken from statements by Americans.]

DeVos, G. "A Comparison of the Personality Differences in Two Generations of Japanese Americans by Means of the Rorschach Test." *Nagoya Journal of Medical Science*, 17, 1954, pp. 153-265.

DeVos, G. "A Quantitative Rorschach-Assessment of Maladjustment and Japanese Americans." *Genetic Psychology Monogram*, 52, Aug., 1955, pp. 53-87. [A statistical discussion of the use of Rorschach tests for the measurement of maladjustment in the acculturation of Japanese-Americans. No generalizations about the American norm, only deviants.]

Dewhurst, J.F., et. al. "America's Needs and Resources." NY: Twentieth Century Fund, 1947. [A summary book on the economic resources and the consumptive patterns of the American people in 1947 and 1955.]

Dhairyam, D. "Personality Differences Between a Hindu and an American Group." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1956, p. 1218.

Dolto, F. "French and American Children as Seen by a French Child Analyst." Childhood in Contemporary Cultures, M. Mead and W. Wolfenstein. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Dos Passos, John: U.S.A. NY: Houghliton-Mifflin, 1946. [A three volume set, dealing with the U.S. at the turn of the century (#1); with WWI (#2); and the late 1920's (#3). It is a prose commentary on the United States useful for background material.]

Drucker, Peter. America's Next Twenty Years. NY: Harper and Bros., 1957.

Duijker, H.L. and N.A. Frijda. National Character and National Stereotypes. vol. 1, Confluence. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing co., 1960. [An excellent reference work. Discusses national character and national stereotypes, and contains a very comprehensive bibliography of studies and a "register of national character studies."]

Ehrenfels, U.R. "Some Observations on American Kinship." American Anthropologist, 58, 1956, p. 918. [Short criticism of Schneider and Homan's, "Kinship Terminology and the American Kinship System." It centers on questions of residence and succession.]

Family Study Center. First Annual Report, 1951-1952. University of Chicago, 1953. [The report of the first year of operation of the family study center. A short outline of the research programs, publications, etc. (Nothing on values, characteristics, etc. of American society.)]

Farber, M.L. "English and Americans: A Study in National Character." Journal of Psychology, 32, 1951, pp. 241-249. [A report of research comparing the English and the Americans. Interesting statistical application to a highly abstract problem of investigation.]

Folsom, Marion B., Chairman, (Sub) Committee for the Improvement of Management in Government, et. al. Modernizing Local Government, New York: Committee for Economic Development (711 5th Ave., N.Y., 10022), 1966.

Freymond, Jacques. "American in European Eyes." The Annals, 295, Sept. 1954, pp. 33-41. [Capsulized statements about America from the French and Italians. They provide, in the main, foreign views about American culture.]

Gendell, M. and Hans L. Zennerberg. A Sociological Almanac for the United States. 2nd ed., New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1964. [An up-to-date summary, in statistical form, of the U.S. Contains 75-100 separate tables and summary essay. Interesting, but little on values or American characteristics.]

Gillin, John. "National and Regional Cultural Values in the U.S." Social Forces, 34, 1955, pp.107-113. [Mainly listings of values in America. Specifies dominant general American values and also regional sub-cultural values. An excellent checklist for comparison with others.]

Goals for Americans, Comprising the Report of the President's Commission on National Goals and Chapters Submitted for the Consideration of the Commission, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.

Goldschmidt, Walter. "Notes." American Quarterly, 3, 1951, pp. 259-267. [A general examination of short stories and a play, showing some themes which apply to American culture and values.]

________ . "Social Class and the Dynamics of Status in America." American Anthropologist, 57, 1955, pp. 1209-1217. [Discussion of social class, its determinants and consequences. Some interesting material on related topics (family, mobility, etc.)]

Goodman, M.E. "Values, Attitudes, and Social Concepts of Japanese and American Children." American Anthropologist, 59, 1957, pp. 979-999. [An experiment on the career choices of Japanese and American children, providing a basis for inferences concerning systematic features of the social views of youth. Some tentative conclusions.]

Gorer, Geoffrey. *The American People, A Study in National Character*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1948. A commentary on the U.S. between 1938 and 1948. [A highly theoretical study, with psychoanalytic overtones, and controversial conclusions about the American character.]

Graham, M.D. "An Experiment in International Attitudes Research." *International Social Science Bulletin*, 3, 1951, pp. 529-531. [A study of the American stereotypes held by a sample of British people shortly after WWII. No direct comparison to actual American characteristics.]

Guide to the Study of the United States of America. United States Library of Congress. Washington, 1960. [Lists a series of bibliographical studies on the United States. In 32 chapters, describes approximately 10,000 books that reflect the development of life and thought in the United States. Extensive treatment of such fields as literature; periodicals and journalism; geography; general, diplomatic, military, intellectual and local history; population, migration and minorities; society; communications; science and technology; medicine and public health; entertainment; sports and recreation; education; religion; folklore; music; art and architecture; economic life; constitution and government; law and justice; politics; parties, and elections.]

Gunther, John. *Inside U.S.A.* New York: Harper and Brothers. Revised Ed. 1951. [An excellent guide to the U.S., but with very little useful material on American society or culture.]

Harding, Charles F., III. "The Social Anthropology of American Industry." *American Anthropologist*, 57, 1955, pp. 1218-1231. [An outline of American Industry. Discussion of the various interrelationships within and between industries. Includes a discussion of labor within the industrial institution. A broad theoretical treatment.]

Harrington, J.C. "Archaeology as an Auxiliary Science to American History," *American Anthropologist*, 57, 1955, pp. 1121-1130. [Interesting discussion of the use of archeological methods in the study of peoples of European origin on the North American continent.]

Hart, Hornell. "Atomic Cultural Lag: I the Value Frame." *Sociology and Social Research*. 32, 1948, pp. 768-776. [A research report of one of the author's pursuits. Provides some material on values, especially the "maintenance" values (i.e., characteristics already possessed which need to be protected.)]

Hart, Hornell. "Atomic Cultural Lag: II Its Measurement." *Sociology and Social Research*, 32, 1948, pp. 845-856. [A description of a method for measuring atomic cultural lag (as used in the previously noted study).]

Haufmann, E. "Social Perception in Russian D.P.'s and an American Comparison Group." *Psychiatry*, 20, 1957, pp. 131-149. [A research report of a comparison between two groups, the Russians and the Americans. Generalizations are made to Russian and American populations, but they seem to be more personality-oriented than value-oriented.]

Havinghurst, R.J., and B.L. Nengarten. *American Indian and White Children: A Sociopsychological Investigation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Hertzler, J.O. *American Social Institutions: A Sociological Analysis*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1961.

Hsu, Francis L.K. *Americans and Chinese: Two Ways of Life*. New York: Schuman, 1953. [An anthropological contrast (with sociological undertones) between the ways of life of the two ethnic groups. It provides some interesting insights into both cultures and contains some well-documented statements of value.]

Humphrey, N.D. "The Mexican Image of Americans." *The Annals*, 295, Sept., 1954, pp. 116-125. [A discussion of the sterotypes about America, held by the various categories or groups of Mexicans who are exposed to American culture. No allusion to actual American characteristics.]

Institute of International Education, *Meet the U.S.A.* [A very perceptive handbook prepared for foreign students. It relies on a strong combination of authoritative and illustrative works for support. No connection with actual research, but still very worthwhile.]

Junek, O.W. "What Is the Total Pattern of Our Western Civilization? Some Preliminary Observations." *American Anthropologist* 48, 1946, pp. 397-406. [A highly theoretical and abstract statement about some of the trends in western civilization. Most of the statements of worth seem to be of the thesis-antithesis form, presenting questions about the treatment of the variables.]

Kahl, Joseph A. *The American Class Structure*, New York: Rinehart, 1957. [A textbook of social stratification, incorporating much of the related research information of the last thirty years.]

Kidd, B. *Principles of Western Civilization*. New York: Macmillan, 1902. [A theoretical discussion based on Darwinism. Sufficient for a historical perspective, but too outdated for a contemporary analysis.]

Kimball, Solon T. "Problems of Studying American Culture." *American Anthropologist*, 57, 1955, pp. 1131-1142. [A discussion of the application of anthropological techniques (e.g. event analysis) to the study of American society; and the ennumeration of the various problems involved in such an application.]

Klapp, Orrin E. *Heroes, Villains, and Fools: The Changing American Character*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Klineberg, O. "A Science of National Character." *Journal of Social Psychology*, 19, 1944, pp. 147-162. [A discussion of the concept of national character, its importance to social science, and some of the means by which its study may be implemented.]

Klinger, M.R.B. "Moral Values Across Cultures." *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 41, Oct., 1962, pp. 139-143 . [A report of a research project. An attempt at distinguishing foreign student groups from American students on the basis of their respective expressed moral values.]

Kluckhohn, Clyde. *Mirror for Man*, Greenwich: Fawcett Publications, Inc., 1963. [An introduction to anthropology and to culture in general. The eighth chapter--"An Anthropologist Looks at the U.S."--is an excellent discussion of contemporary America.]

———. "Physical Anthropology." *American Anthropologist*, 1955, pp. 1280-1295. [A brief survey of some of the anthropometric and morphological studies of the dominant American population. Nothing regarding cultural characteristics, etc.]

———. "Shifts in American Values." *World Politics*, 2, Jan., 1959. [A review of Max Lerner's *America as a Civilization*, and a theoretical statement by the author of the directions and magnitudes of changes in the American system of values.]

———. "The Evolution of Contemporary American Values." *Daedalus*, 87, Spring, 1958, pp. 78-109. [Much of the article is a statement of the ways in which the American value system has evolved in time. (An earlier and less complete statement of the material in the preceding reference, "Shifts in American Values."]

———. "Values and Value Orientation..." *Toward a General Theory of Action*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

Komarovsky, M. "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles." *American Journal of Sociology*, 52, Nov., 1946, pp. 184-189. [Discusses the nature of the incompatible sex roles placed on college women by the society today.]

Kwiat, Joseph J. and Mary C. Turpie, eds., *Studies in American Culture: Dominant Ideas and Images*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960.

Lambert, R.D. and M. Bressler. "Indian Students and the United States: Cross-cultural Images." The Annals, 295, pp. 62-72. [Primarily a discussion of three areas of American life: (1) family practices and values, (2) recent political behavior, and (3) race relations. Provides some material meriting comparison with other sources.]

Lambert, W.E. "Comparison of French and American Modes of Response to the Bogardus Social Distance Scale." Social Forces, December, 1952, pp. 155-159. [A methodologically inclined discussion of the application of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale cross culturally--in this case the French and Americans.]

Landes , Ruth. "Biracialism in American Society: A Comparative View." American Anthropology, 1956, pp. 1253-1263. [The comparison of American biracialism (Negro-White) with that of the British. An interesting discussion of the differences between the two countries and their societal systems.]

Hantz, Herman R. People of Coaltown. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958. [A conceptual scheme developed to explore the relationships within a community revealed through study. As such it is an interesting method. However, before accepting the data, more rigorous methodological proceddures could be followed.]

LeMasters, E.E. Modern Courtship and Marriage. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1959. [A textbook concerning the familial institution. Provides a good survey of the American family, and also at times suggests accurate criticisms or faults.]

Lerner, Max. America As A Civilization. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957.

Lewin, K. "Some Socio-Psychological Differences Between the U.S. and Germany." Character and Personality, 4, 1936. pp. 265-293. [The report of a research project comparing the general national characteristics of the Germans and the Americans. Is in strong agreement with D.C. McClelland's "Obligations to Self and Society in the U.S. and Germany."]

Leyburn, James. "Notes on American Culture." *Common Ground*, Winter, 1945, pp. 61-65 . [A theoretical treatment of the concept of culture and what it consists of. There is no explicit mention of any specific American values or characteristics.]

Link, H.C. "What Does Americanism Mean to the American People?" *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 31, 1947, pp. 425-430. [A summary of results and findings from a study made by the author. The data are interesting, but no conclusions or interpretations are given concerning the topic--the American value structure.]

Linton, Ralph. "Geoffrey Gorer's 'The American People: An Anthropologist's Critical View.'" *Scientific American*, May, 1948, pp. 58-59. [This article is simply a review of Gorer's, *The American People*. Linton discredits much of Gorer's work, but mediates it to a minor degree by stating that Gorer did make a number of penetrating observations about the modern American scene.]

Lipset, S.M. " A Changing American Character?" in S.M. Lipset and L. Lowenthal (eds.) , *Culture and Social Character*, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961.

Lowie, Robert H. Review of *The American People*, by G. Gorer in *Man*, 57, 1949. p. 37.
[Another review of *The American People*. The content is much the same as that of Linton's, plus specifically noting Gorer's basic postulate.]

McClelland, D.C. "Obligations to Self and Society in the U.S. and Germany." *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, March, 1953, pp. 98-101 . [A report of a study carries out by the author contrasting some attitudes of Germans and Americans. There are some well thought out statements of the differences, substantiated by the research basis of the study.]

McDonald, Donald. "Science: An Interview With Hans Bethe", Fund for the Republic, Inc., New York, 1962. [A discussion of science, education, and defense between the author and a scientist. It is interesting but contains no reference to any "general American" characteristics.]

———. "Stage and Screen Interviews With Walter Kerr, Drama Critic, New York Herald Tribune, and Stanley Kramer, Film Producer and Director", Fund for the Republic, Inc., 1962. [Both interviews discuss the decline in the quality of the stage and screen, and point to the future. There are only implied references to national values, character, and so on.]

———. "Television: An Interview With Jack Gould, Television Critic of the *New York Times*, Fund for the Republic, Inc., 1961. [The first interview concerns cities from a predominantly architectural point of view. The record deals with the city as a political system.]

———. "The Police: An Interview With W.H. Parker, Chief of Police, Los Angeles," Fund for the Republic, Inc., 1962. [An interesting commentary on police matters by Chief Parker. He also makes several statements in reference to generalized characteristics in American society.]

———. "The Press": Interviews with Mark Ethridge, *Louisville Courier-Journal* and *Times*, and C.V. Jackson, *Life Magazine*. Fund for the Republic, Inc. 1961. [Two interviews providing an interesting viewpoint of the functions of the newspaper and the large-circulation magazine. However, of little concern to the study of American values.]

McGranahan, D.V. "A Comparison of Social Attitudes Among American and German Youth." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, July, 1946, pp. 245-257. [The report of a research project concerning social attitudes of youths of two cultures. Some generalizations are made about the American and German cultures. Useful for comparison with other results.]

———, and I. Wayne. "German and American Traits Reflected in Popular Drama." *Human Relations*, January, 1948, pp. 429-455. [A study of American and German characteristics as seen in popular drama. Most statements are in reference to underlying psychological discussions, which are, in turn, generalized to cultural traits.]

Mandelbaum, D.G. "On the Study of National Character." *American Anthropologist*, 55, 1953, pp. 174+. [A definition of national culture and national character plus some suggestions as to procedure to follow in the study of both concepts.]

Martindale, Don A. *American Society*. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1960. [A theoretical discourse on the concept of "mass society" (with reference to the U.S.) and its historical and theoretical bases. It also reports some of the major manifestations of a mass society, and makes inferences to their presence in America.]

Mason, Leonard. "The Characterization of American Culture in Studies of Acculturation." *American Anthropologist*, 57, 1955. pp. 1264 ff. [A sketch of American culture covering the topics of Ethos, Technology, Economics, and some of the major institutions. Some good statements and insights.]

Mead, Margaret. *And Keep Your Powder Dry*. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1942. [One of the early attempts to analyze American culture. There is a great deal of insightful material and numerous (later substantiated) generalizations. An excellent source work for the study of American society.]

———. "The American Character in Its Relation to International Understanding." 1947. (Available at Harvard Education School Library.)

———. "The Contemporary American Family as an Anthropologist Sees It." *American Journal of Sociology*, May, 1948, pp. 453-459. [An article concerning the American familial institution, from the viewpoint of an anthropologist. The author centers her discussion on the general patterns, and the major readjustments that the family is making or will be making.]

Merriam, Alan P. "Music in American Culture." *American Anthropologist*, 57, 1955, pp. 1173-1181. [The author discusses various types of music and how they reflect certain aspects of American culture. He also notes the lack of available research and indicates some possibilities for fruitful studies.]

Moberg, D.O. *The Church as a Social Institution: The Sociology of American Religion*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962.

Morrison, E.E., ed., *The American Style*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Muhlen, N. "America and American Occupation in German Eyes: America Through Foreign Eyes," *The Annals*, Sept, 1954, pp.52-61. [A discussion of German attitudes with regard to the U.S. (with historical basis), not of German attitudes about American culture, values, general characteristics, etc.]

Myrdal, Gunner, *An American Dilemma*. New York: Harper, 1944. [A classic study of American society. Numerous insights into cultural and societal aspects. His statement of the American creed is especially helpful in providing comparative material.]

NEA Staff Committee on Structure. *A Proposal for A Complete Study of the Structure of the National Education Association*. January, 1965. (Mimeo paper) [This paper makes some statements about trends that are occurring in American society and which are resulting in recognizable changes.]

"One Nation, Divisible by 80,000 Governments." *Carnegie Quarterly*, 14, Fall, 1966, pp. 4-5. (Carnegie Corporation of New York) [A study of the inefficiency, and the difficulty of control by the electorate, resulting from the decentralization of governmental units, particularly as they affect education.]

Opler, Morris K. "Cultural Values and Attitudes on Child Care," *Children*, February, 1955, pp. 45-50. [Discussion of various sub-cultural attitudes toward child care and child-rearing methods. There are no references to any generalized American patterns.]

Parsons, Talcott. Essays in Sociological Theory: Pure and Applied, rev. ed., Glencoe: The Free Press, 1954.

Passin, H., and J.W. Bennett. "The America-Educated Japanese, I: America Through Foreign Eyes." The Annals. Sept, 1954, 295, pp. 89-96 . [A study of the images of America held by Japanese students educated in the United States. The statements are a combination of the usual (i.e., the non-culture bearer's stereotypically based attitudes) and critical comments regarding the more notorious of American characteristics, such as materialism.]

————. "The America-Educated Japanese, II: America Through Foreign Eyes. The Annals, 295, Sept. 1954, pp. 97-107. [This article is a sequel to the above by the same authors. It is, in essence, a discussion of those images of America held by the same subjects after their return to Japan.]

Potter, David M. People of Plenty: Economic Abundance and the American Character. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954. [A discussion of the hypothesis of the effects of abundance on the American national character. A historical perspective, but supplemented by the behavioral sciences.]

Powdermaker, Hortense. "Movies and Values," Modern American Society, Davis, Bredemier, and Levy, New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1950, pp. 555-559. [An analysis of American movies and the values underlying their content.]

Reischauer, E.O. The United States and Japan, Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Rettig, S., and B. Pasamanick. "Changes in Moral Values Among College Students: A Factorial Study." American Sociology Review, 24, 1959, pp. 856-863. [The report of a research project. The statistics are reported in crude form. There are few generalizations about the meaning of the various factors other than their item content.]

————. "Differences in the Structure of Moral Values of Students and Alumni." *American Sociology Review*, 25, 1960 pp. 550-555. [A highly technical and statistical discussion of the six morality factors tested in the research project. No explanation or expansion of the factors other than the item content.]

————. Invariance in Factor Structure of Moral Value Judgments from American and Korean College Students." *Sociometry*, 25, 1962, pp. 73-84. [A technical discussion of Korean and American college students' moral value judgements. There are no references to a general American configuration.]

————. "Moral Value Structure and Social Class." *Sociometry*, 24, 1961, pp. 21-35. [Another technical discussion of comparative moral structures; here between two socio-economic classes in America. There also is no explanation of the factors in this study, thus no reference to general patterns.]

Riesmann, David, et. al. *The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950. [A very well-known book dealing with the diverse ways in which individuals at various stages of society have formed different systems of values. A mixture of the sociological and psychological approaches.]

Ruesch, Jurgen, and G. Bateson. *Communications: The Social Matrix of Psychiatry*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1951.

Schlesinger, Arthur M., Sr. "What Then Is the American, This New Man?", *American Historical Review*, January, 1943, pp. 225-244. [A listing and expansion of those American traits and characteristics which are most frequently noted in the reports of foreign visitors.]

Schneider, David C., and George C. Homans. "Kinship Terminology and the American Kinship System." *American Anthropologist*, 57, 1955, pp. 1194-1208. [A report of research on kinship terminology in the United States, and some characteristics of the American kinship system. Some insights into the American familial institution.]

Scott, F.D. "The Swedish Student's Image of the United States. America Through Foreign Eyes," The Annals, 295, Sept. 1954, pp. 136-144 . [A listing of those characteristics felt by Swedish students to be characteristic of American society. Useful for comparison with the views of other extra-culturals (e.g., the Mexicans, Japanese, Germans, etc.).]

Sewell, W.H., R.T. Morris, and O.M. Davidsen. "Scandinavian Students' Images of the United States: A Study in Cross-Cultural Education: America Through Foreign Eyes." The Annals, vol. 295, September, 1954, pp. 126-145. . [Similar to the previous reference, but somewhat more comprehensive in that there are specific references to American social institutions. Also excellent for comparison with other extra-culturals.]

Singer, Milton. "How the American Got His Character." Ethics, 60, Oct. 1949, pp. 62-66.

Sirjamaki, J. "Culture Configurations in the American Family." American Journal of Sociology, May, 1948, pp. 464-470. [A generalized statement of the American family. It is equivalent to his major source, "a footnote to the Anthropological Approach to the Study of American Culture," but here with reference solely to the family.]

Spiegel, J.P. "Conflicting Formal and Informal Roles in Newly Acculturated Families." Research Publications: Association for Research in Neuroses and Mental Diseases, 1964. [Statements of generalized American patterns as abstracted from the study of newly acculturated families. Contains some excellent material on Assumptions as well as several of the value-orientations.]

Spindler, G.D. "American Character as Revealed by the Military." Psychiatry, 1948. [A study of the American military and its effects of authority, power, discipline, status, etc., on the American character.]

———. "Education in a Transforming American Culture," *Harvard Educational Review*, 1955. [A short analysis of the ways in which education mediates and/or instigates cultural change. The author postulates a shift in American values, from the traditional to the emergent.]

Spiro, M.E. "The Acculturation of American Ethnic Groups." *American Anthropologist*, 57, 1955, pp. 1240-1252. [A discussion of acculturation in addition to outlines of some research studies. Some relationships are traced between topics including acculturation and social mobility, nativism, religion, and the family.]

Statistical Abstract of the United States. U. S. Govt. Census Bureau, Wash. D.C., Govt. Printing Office, 1966. [Facts and figures on the economic, political, and social structure of the United States, from more than 200 different sources--Federal agencies, private research groups and individuals, international organizations. Some major subjects are: Agriculture, business, education, employment, foreign trade, geography, health, military services, population, recreation, veterans' affairs, world economy; historical trends; a guide to statistics sources, including State statistical abstracts. Detailed index.]

Stein, Maurice. *The Eclipse of Community: An Interpretation of American Studies.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1960. [Deals with the American community; the theoretical basis for the community; the general effects of urbanization, industrialization, and bureaucratization; and some characteristics of American suburbs.]

Stewart, George R. *American Ways of Life*. New York: Doubleday, 1954. A topical survey of America by a historian.

Stewart, V.G., and L.A. Leland. "American vs. English Mosaics." *Journal of Projective Techniques,* June, 1952, pp. 246-248. [A short discussion of a cross-cultural application of the Lowenfeld Mosaic Test. The findings are reported in highly technical terms, and there are no generalizations to the respective societies.]

Supplementary

Stouffer, S.A. *Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties.* Doubleday, 1955.

Terhume, Kenneth W. "Self and Nation: The Psychological Nature of Nationalism and Patriotism." Diss., Michigan State University, 1963. [A discussion and analysis of American nationalism and patriotism. The perspective is highly psychological and contains few if any useful generalizations about American society.]

Trager, George L. "The Language of America." *American Anthropologist*, 57, 1955, pp. 1182-1193. [A summary and discussion of the structure and characteristics of the North American languages, with technical illustrations of those characteristics. No generalizations of use to the student of culture result from it.]

UNESCO. *Interrelations of Cultures: Their Contribution to International Understanding.* Paris, 1953. [A collection of inter-cultural studies including Japan, China, India, Spain, the United States, and others. The studies are based on different aspects of the several cultures.]

Useem, R.H., and John Useem. "Images of the United States and Britain Held by Foreign-Educated Indians: America Through Foreign Eyes." *The Annals*, 295, Sept, 1954, pp. 73-82. [Another study of America (also Britain) through the eyes of extra-culturals, in this case foreign-educated Indians. As in the numerous other instances, the listing and explanation generated here are of comparative value.]

Vogt, Evon Z. "American Subcultural Continua as Exemplified by the Mormons and Texans." *American Anthropologist*, 57, 1955, pp. 1163-1172. [A discussion of an additional type of variation in Ameridan culture--historically derived subcultural continuum (as distinct from variation by age, sex, region, social class, etc.)]

Warner, W.L. *American Life*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953. [A summary restatement of the author's previous studies. Some treatment of the theory and method of the social anthropologist, but mainly on the social stratification system of the U.S.]

Warner, W.L., Marchai Meeker, and Kenneth Fells. *Social Class in America*. Chicago: Science Research Associates Library, New York: Harper and Brothers. [A "How to do it' book on the Warnerian method of identifying socio-economic status. There is some information on a few of the related value-orientations and an excellent bibliography.]

————. *Structure of American Life*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 1952. [A summary of modern American social structure with particular emphasis on social class. This work contains an annotated bibliography which is a good source of materials.]

Washington International Center of the American Council on Education: *Handbook for Travelers to the U.S.A.*, Wash. [The fourteenth chapter in particular, 'Social Customs and Home Life,' has some information relevant to the study of American culture.]

Wayne, I. "American and Soviet Themes and Values: A Content Analysis of Pictures in Popular Magazines." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Spring, 1956, pp. 314-320. [This article is mostly a discussion of the Russian cultural configuration. There are statements about aspects of American culture, but these can be used only for substantiation.]

Wecter, Dixon, et. al. *Changing Patterns in American Civilization*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1949. [An anthology of papers concerning American culture. Some of the topics covered include literature, science, and religion. Generally of little use to a summarization of American society.]

Wienberg, M., and Shabat, O.E. *Society and Man*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956. [An introductory textbook in sociology dealing with the usual societal divisions; the social institutions, social class, race relations, and so on.]

Weissbourd, Bernard. "Segregation, Subsidies, and Megalopolis." Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Fund for the Republic, Inc., 1964. [A commentary on urban conditions in contemporary America, but contains little information on cultural characteristics.]

Westley-Gibson, D. *Social Perspectives on Education: The Society, The Student, The School*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965.

Whyte, William H. *The Organization Man*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956. [This book is a well-known analysis of some of the trends present in American society today. There is much material regarding the concept of organization as it applies to American culture.]

Wirth, L. "The Urban Way of Life." *Modern American Society*, Davis, Bredemeir, and Levy, New York: Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1949. [This article is a commentary on the "style of life" in America's cities. There are some valuable insights into the character of urban social relations.]

Wolfenstein, M., and Nathan Leites. *Movies: A Psychological Study*. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1950. [This book is an attempt to abstract some of the values of American society out of the content of movie plots. It is primarily psychological in approach, yet there are some worthwhile generalizations, especially the major plot configuration.]

Woods, Sister Francis Jerome. *Cultural Values of American Ethnic Groups*. New York: Harper, 1956.